

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. XV

JANUARY, 1930

No. 1

EDITORIAL

THE APPLICATION OF THE INTELLECTUAL POWERS TO religion is necessary, but there is a tendency now toward their disproportionate use. Christians are becoming extremely wary about the emotional, though it is apparent that many fail to discriminate between emotional and spiritual. For this reason any utterance of the predominantly "inspirational" kind is likely to be slighted, if not regarded with frank disfavor. But people need to be brought to feel, as well as to see, the import of certain things.

Prayer is a subject about which volumes have been written and spoken in late years; yet prayer remains quite largely the church's "lost art." But it must be regained and given its rightfully great place in Christian life if the church is to recover her vitality and to have a meaning in the world greater than any indicated by tables of statistics.

The short article by Mr. Belden, *The Instinctive Nature and the Practice of Prayer*, deals with both the analytical and spiritual aspects of the subject, but it emphasizes the latter. Starting with a discussion of the instinct to pray, at least at critical moments, which may be regarded as universal in humanity, the author then passes to the efficient practice of prayer. His chief ap-

peal is to our spiritual side, and so might perhaps be classed as inspirational; but it is reasoned and forceful and may bring to the reader's mind and heart some vital things about the prayer life that have been overlooked or forgotten. Such a reminder as this of a chief spiritual duty and opportunity is not lightly to be dismissed.

A PERSISTENT QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO THE SCRIPTURES is that of inspiration. While believers unite in affirming most earnestly that the Bible was inspired by God in such a way as to be in a distinct and unique sense His one great written revelation to men, they differ as to the exact mode of inspiration. Of course firm holders of this or that theory see nothing to differ about; certain verses in the Bible itself clearly settle the matter. The more thoughtful students, however, speak with some caution, not feeling sure that God Himself has seen fit to reveal all of His processes, though asking man to accept the results.

Although belief in any particular mode cannot be made an acid test of one's faith and right to Christian fellowship, yet lovers of the Scriptures find the whole subject of sufficient importance to lead them to welcome anything that may shed light on it. Mr. Hoyle's paper, *Philo on Inspiration*, will strengthen faith in inspiration and emphasize the Spirit's work therein, whether the mode is left a mystery or not.

At the outset Philo's response to man's universal desire to know more about God and His ways of dealing with men is briefly set forth, and the rest of the space is given to Philo's views as to who experience the inspirational work of God, what the experience is, how far Philo himself had it, and how his experience of the Spirit compared with Paul's. On the latter point it might be

said that the main point in the paper is this comparison of the Philonic and Pauline utterances on the subject. The effect of Greek thought on Philo's thinking is shown, as also his less complete resources for dealing with the question as compared with Paul's. Through the outpouring of the Spirit upon believers now "the veil grows thin," and "the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" shines through.

ITALY IS FOR THE MOMENT THE CENTER OF ATTENTION for students of religious and educational affairs. This double interest is more than a coincidence, for it is slowly coming to be perceived that religion and education cannot be divorced if the best culture is to be attained, and recent events in Italy have brought the question of their proper relation again to the front.

Dr. Tagliatela, a distinguished leader in Italian Protestantism, in *The Problem of Italian Education*, writes as a native student of the history and facts relating to his subject and also from intimate personal experience. It may be added that this exceptionally clear and informing article has been written in English, and so has escaped the uncertainties of translation.

After a sketch of Italian history in recent centuries, as it bears upon his subject, the author takes up the country's educational problems under conditions in the late past and the present. "When, where, and how," he asks, "was Italy to face and solve the problem of education?" His answers reveal the unfavorable influence of the Roman Church upon educational progress; not that it was actually opposed, but that it was narrowed, hindered, and directed toward the interests of the church as such. Nevertheless, there was in the keen Italian mind a deep native hunger for truth and culture, as well as

for liberty, and there appear here many names of men notable in keeping these aspirations alive and in contributing toward the present more favorable situation.

Comparatively few American students are really aware of Italy's contribution to literature and learning, and one of the valuable features of this paper is the glimpse it affords into this attractive field. Altogether, it is not only informing upon a very important situation of our day, but shows a refreshing scholarship and stimulates to reflection.

ESCHATOLOGY HAS ITS PROPER PLACE IN THE CHRISTIAN system of doctrine, but in large sections of the church it is almost entirely neglected. Various reasons might be offered to account for this, and one at least would be the distortion by extremists of the Scriptural teachings upon the last things. Lest they stir up persons of this kind, many sound Bible students avoid public testimony on the doctrine of the Lord's return, even though they regard it as important.

Nevertheless we do have some very thoughtful deliverances in this field, one of which Dr. MacInnis gives under the title, *Israel—the Fulfillment of the Promise*. This is an endeavor to answer the question, whether or not there is to be a literal earthly restoration of the Kingdom of Israel, with our Lord as King upon the throne of David. Many who look for the premillennial return of our Lord confidently expect certain prophecies of the Kingdom to be fulfilled in this way, quite literally. Others, of the same general faith as to the Lord's return, believe that the Kingdom prophecies as yet unfulfilled by Christ's first coming will find full realization in a spiritual Israel that has succeeded the earthly.

Dr. MacInnis holds the latter view. Realizing that this important difference of interpretation has provoked sharp controversy, he refuses in this treatment of the question even to refer to opinions held by those who are debating the matter, but seeks to establish his position solely through the Scriptures. Judgment as to the soundness of his case is left to the reader, but we commend the spirit and the ability with which he conducts his argument.

ONE OF THE MOST SIGNIFICANT RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS in late years is that known as personal evangelism. Its significance lies quite largely in its hope of reviving the lay sense of responsibility for advancing the cause of our Lord. It requires no scholarly knowledge of the great evangelical revivals of the past to discover the vital part played by the laity. Humanly speaking, there have been times when the layman has saved the church. Leaders know that, if the church is to be aroused from her present lethargy and become aggressive and triumphant again, the layman must realize both his duties and his possibilities.

Perhaps we have thought of personal evangelism as chiefly a method for the cities. Is it practical for rural sections? Dr. McLaughlin answers this question, in *Visitation Evangelism in the Country Church*, out of a long and rich experience, both as a successful country pastor and lately as the director of the country church work in his denomination. In this paper he covers present conditions and the methods necessary to meet them, drawing freely from his own personal observations in the country pastorate and from his more recent studies of rural problems. There is nothing revolutionary or spectacular in his counsel. If his advice seems to be

elementary it must be remembered that he has in mind a social group that deals in simple and direct terms about practical things.

This is not an article for the ambitious young pulpiteer who endures a rural parish merely as a starting place for reaching a city congregation of cultured people. But it is rich in suggestion for the man who rejoices to find himself in a needy field where there is much to be done, and where patient well-doing will one day bring in a harvest.

THE BOOKS REVIEWED IN THIS NUMBER ARE AS FOLLOWS:

The Gospel According to Saint Mark.—Blunt.

The Humanity of God.—Buckham.

A Preface to Morals.—Lippmann.

The Church in History.—Nagler.

Babylonian Life and History.—Budge.

College Organization and Administration.—Reeves and Russell.

R. M. K.

Induced

THE INSTINCTIVE NATURE AND THE PRACTICE OF PRAYER

By REV. ALBERT D. BELDEN, B.D.

PRAYER may be simply defined as the appeal of the soul to God. This definition has the double merit that it emphasizes the petitionary element never entirely absent from true prayer, and yet covers also that type of prayer which is best referred to as communion. For there are many grades of the prayer life, from the instinctive, primitive, and unreasoned cry of the soul in peril or pain, to the lofty musings and meditations of the saint who walks humbly and daily with his God.

The prayer life of man lies rooted in his instinctive recognition of his dependence on some power or being greater than himself. This instinctive and primitive sense of dependence expresses itself involuntarily in times of sharp stress or crisis when one's helplessness is brought home to him. Prayer begins in an instinct as fundamental as those of hunger and thirst. In Psalm 107 the Hebrew writer, in a satirical turn of mind, shows us picture after picture of folk in trouble, all of them crying naturally and inevitably "unto the Lord in their distress." "When the devil is sick, the devil a saint would be." *When the devil is well, the devil a saint he*

During the Great War soldiers again and again assured me that "Out there," meaning the battle front, "we all pray." "Out there we are all religious." Just as surely as an animal cries out in its pain, so surely does the soul feel after God, if haply it may find Him, in the hour of peril. This is why religion can never die, al-

though it may change its forms. Prayer is the heart of religion, and it beats as long as the bodily heart itself. Whilst there is life, there is prayer. Though it may lie dormant and feeble for long it springs into life immediately at the call of a desperate situation.

Confirmation of these assertions may be obtained first, and best, by an appeal to personal experience. What does one know of one's own soul in danger or great need? Second, it may be obtained by an appeal to the universality of religion. Wherever man is found in history he is discovered to be "religious." Wherever he is found on the face of the earth, he is found "worshipping" and possessed by some conception of a Greater Power—a Deity or deities.

It was formerly thought that there were savage peoples without religion at all. It has been discovered, however, that primitive peoples often take great care to hide their religious practices and have thus misled travelers into thinking they have none. There is today no doubt among anthropological authorities that religion is universal. Religion and therefore prayer are thus seen to be natural and instinctive to man wherever he is found, and in this fact we have a strong inducement to believe in the reality of that God to whom the soul of man is thus ever appealing. For, if there were no such God or if He were indifferent, it would be the first instance known to science of Nature providing a universal instinct or impulse for which no possible satisfaction exists.

Here then is a striking and impressive fact, that prayer is fundamental to human nature. Man is so made that he must appeal from his evident limitations to some Greater Power. The memory of his origin, as it were, is built into him and abides with him, and, like the

Prodigal Son in the far country, the sting of ill-fortune or calamity or sharp need causes him to recall his home and the Father who waits to bless and to restore.

Men continue for this reason to pray, even when they feel to the full the logical difficulties that prayer presents. Professor William James says: "We have in these days of scientific enlightenment a great deal of discussion about the efficacy of prayer, and many reasons are given us why we should not pray whilst others are given why we should. But in all this, very little is said of the reason why we do pray—which is simply *that we cannot help praying*. It seems probable that in spite of all that science may do to the contrary, men will continue to pray to the end of time." The soul's instinct for God may be crushed and repressed, but in moments of crisis it will find dramatic resurrection. Carlyle was right when he wrote, "Prayer is and remains the natural and deepest impulse of the soul of men."

Now, whatever development prayer may present as humanity rises in the scale of religion, this "instinct" to make appeal to God is itself never outgrown. It may be motivated differently, an increasing sense of "the fitness of things" may change its forms of expression and its rationale, but the practice persists. In this feature prayer is by no means unique among our instincts. The instincts for language and for music begin just as crudely, find constant development towards more refined forms of expression, and continue to be an ever increasing help and delight to human society. It is a far cry from the tom-tom of the savage to a Stradivarius violin, yet behind both is the instinctive passion of the human soul for musical sound. What a contrast between Samson's prayer, "O Lord Jehovah, strengthen me that I may be avenged of the Philistines," and the prayer of

Stephen, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge"; yet behind both is the instinctive upward look of the human soul to the God who alone is our strength.

We may, therefore, recognize with advantage distinct stages in the prayer life of mankind. It begins upon a physical level and is at first crudely materialistic; it passes on through planes of quite superstitious appeals to God by means of human and animal sacrifices; gradually there enters an increasing moral sense, so that to the prayer of word and of purely mental appeal is added the idea of co-operation with God, an increasing faithfulness in the use of such resources of mind and strength as God has already bestowed on mankind. This increasing moralization of prayer under the dominance of an ever developing idea of God, may be regarded as proof of the divine answer to human appeal. God has been found of those who sought Him. The more men have sought God, the more God has come into human life, literally teaching men "how to pray." So that today we are realizing that true and perfect prayer is achieved only in the perfect correspondence of the soul with God—mind speaking to Mind, heart beating with Heart, will co-operating with Will, life echoing Life. Perfect prayer is indeed "without ceasing." It is a perfect balance of equation between *Orare est laborare* and *Laborare est orare*.

The governing factor in this historical and psychological development of prayer is, of course, the idea of God held by the human mind. Where God is viewed with fear and suspicion prayer is often craven; where His holiness is unrealized prayer is often immoral; where His majesty is obscured prayer is often irreverent; but as His nature becomes more fully revealed as almighty love, so the appeals made by men find im-

*where His love is not realized,
confidence is lacking.*

provement until, in the presence of the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, they find it impossible to pray other than as Jesus prayed. It is a principle of anthropology that the individual repeats in miniature and in general the story of the race's development, and in the prayer development of the individual life something of this kind is seen.

Jesus manifested His divine wisdom when He insisted upon making fatherhood and sonship the main key to the understanding of religion. In a child's relation to its parent the appeal of the lesser life to the greater begins at birth, and is at first purely instinctive. It passes into a stage of naïve desire for merely material good when the boy's father is just a penny bank or a toy emporium. The child glimpses no moral problem in the father's free supply of all his demands. By the discipline of his unanswered prayers, however, and by the discovery, enriched every day, of his father's will and nature and desires, he learns what to ask for and how to ask for it. His desires and his demands become increasingly reasonable. When his father denies a request he appreciates the reason and its wisdom. Not that there is any sense of bondage regarding petition; he does not cease to ask for things. Even when sharing to the full the fellowship of adult life with his father, he will still feel free to make petitions, but his petition now is motivated intelligently and nobly. It is important to realize that "petition" persists as an element in the prayer life. As a child lives with its father, so, Jesus would have us think, man lives with God in a relation of personal dependence and personal appeal growing purer and richer and sweeter the more he grows in the knowledge of the divine Father.

Such is prayer—the soul's instinctive appeal to God

growing increasingly intelligent and increasingly free as God becomes better and better known. God has become better known—prayer has been crowned with this supreme and vital success.

Now, if our argument thus far has been sound, if the fundamental thing in prayer is the soul's appeal to God, if God is a personal Father as Jesus taught us to believe, and if prayer is natural and instinctive in every potential child of God, then our next consideration and concern must be, not the rationale of prayer, not the clearing up of its logical problems, but its efficient practice.

Undoubtedly it is just here that our failure is greatest. We leave this fundamental instinct of the soul to operate in a too fitful and spasmodic manner. This divine impulse we permit to wander in and out of our consciousness with the changefulness of changing circumstance. Hosts of men and women in full control of their powers fail utterly to grasp and use and develop and explore this supreme instinctive act of the human spirit. Other instincts, such as the two I have mentioned, speech and music, we develop and study and map out and systematize. We discover the laws of their operation, and we bring them to the position of "fine arts." Why should not prayer also be thus lifted out of its primitive condition into a great art of life?

And the great high road to knowledge about prayer is to be found in praying. Did not Jesus say, "Whoso willeth to do the will of God shall know of the doctrine"? Is it not all too sadly true that the folk who are most oppressed by the "problems" of prayer are the people who have least "praying" experience? "Pray," says Jeremy Taylor, "and you shall pray oftener." Exactly. It is our failure to put God to the test that maintains

our impression that God is not there to be tested. Yet it is safe to assert that most of us have had answers to instinctive petitions. Look into your own experience and notice how more than once the most desperate situations have been relieved. How wonderfully you have been brought through the most difficult trials and perplexities, and yet how little you may have realized the close connection between those desperate, unreasoned appeals to God and the gradual, or sometimes sudden, resolution of your difficulty. If this has happened only once or twice in response to appeals that were really selfish and in only the minutest degree God-honoring, what might not happen if you set yourself really to seek God's face and to seek Him for Himself and with all your heart set purely upon His will?

The facts about prayer constitute a sharp and clear call for experiment on the part of us all. *Solvitur ambulando* has been a favorite method of human progress in all realms, a method forced upon men by the practical emergencies of life. If it is a fact that I must pray, and do pray when "cornered" by circumstances, then the better I pray the better for me. Let me, then, master the practice while there is leisure and time, remembering that here as elsewhere only practice makes perfect. What incredible folly to ignore the possibility of adding God to one's resources. If it be true that He "waits to be gracious" then is it not sheer stupidity to make no trial of His love?

How patiently men will search for gold; what years of research and sacrifice of health they will endure for science; what devotion they will show to art! But to know God—! They do not realize that attention is the one thing needed to develop the inwardness of reality. Attend to botany, and flowers reveal a thousand realities

of beauty to which the inattentive eye is blind. Attend to music, and the soul discovers a whole world of cadence and harmony to which before it was quite deaf. Look across the sea with the eyes of the sailor trained in a hundred voyages, and it is crowded with realities to which the landsman's vision gives him no clue. Similarly if we are to know God, the Supreme Reality, we must give to Him energetic attention, patient and prolonged consideration.

If, now, we are agreed upon the vital necessity and urgent wisdom of the practice of prayer we are ready to apply our regulative principle, namely, the idea of God that we possess. We must follow that practice of prayer which best accords with our highest thought of God. The thought of God which is highest in the consciousness of our time, and of all time, is the thought inspired by Jesus which may be summed up in three supreme characteristics: God is personal, God is love, God is holy. These three revealed facts about God teach us the best way of prayer.

1. God is personal. Jesus taught us that God thinks and feels and wills, and is therefore to be thought of as possessing just the same simple reality over against ourselves as a personal human friend possesses. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

Now I cannot help feeling and saying that, for me at least, this logically involves a rejection of all ritual that is elaborate and artificial. A degree of ritual is perhaps unavoidable so long as we dwell in the flesh and amongst material things, but a strong conviction of God as personal is so fundamental to Christian prayer that the greatest care must be exercised to prevent material symbols from absorbing the attention that they are designed only to mediate. A complicated detail of

ritual may easily cloud that sense of God's immediacy which is so vital to a personal relationship. One would not think of deliberately turning from the opportunity of a face to face talk with a friend to speak to him over the telephone. Yet many Christians ignore the possibility of a more spiritual communion with God than some forms of accentuated ritual allow. Someone has defined ritual as simply "the best way of doing things in a public act of worship." If churches would be loyal to that definition and strictly use ritual simply as a means and not as an end, and would check the tendency to a traditional interest in it for its own sake, the result would be such an honoring of the personal relation of the soul to God as would immensely deepen and quicken communion.

There may be something repulsive and unnecessarily harsh in the bare, square, whitewashed bethel of Non-conformity, but the fact cannot be gainsaid that men and women have there beheld the face of God just as clearly as others who have sought the aid of incense, crucifix, and altar, and in doing so they have achieved a great spiritual triumph for the human soul. Is it not the simplest and most direct meeting of man and God that is the most awe-inspiring and the most beautiful?

In our practice of prayer, then, let our first conviction be that we come unto the "living God." He is personal and can make His own impression, and He tolerates no mediator but His own express image, His alter ego, His incarnate self, His very self fitted to the capacity of the human soul, except by whom "no man cometh unto the Father."

2. God is love. According to the teaching of Jesus this fact should breathe a mighty confidence into the praying soul. "If you being evil know how to give . . .

how shall not your heavenly Father give. . . .” The faith that Jesus ever demands of the praying Christian is easy—if God’s love is believed. It is totally wrong and fatal for one who would really pray to think of God as reluctant or unwilling to bless. Yet it is to be feared that this notion is all too common. Such a conception must dry up the fountains of petition and rob prayer of its heart of faith. God is more willing to bless than we to ask, and we will never come to Him unexpectedly if we remember His love. “If he gave . . . his Son . . . how shall he not freely give us all things?”

Then, further, speech never languishes between friends who love; even the silences are golden with eloquence. Prayer is “without ceasing” between hearts attuned in love, and so the constancy of the practice of prayer is also assured. No man realizing God’s love will begrudge time for prayer or let business or pleasure take precedence of his sacred tryst with love. He will not fail in paying attention to the ever present Divine Companion—the “love of Christ will hem him in from straying” just as surely as it did the apostles.

But, besides confidence and constancy, the realized love of God gives a perfect freedom; and who does not know the essential value of a free spirit in prayer? “Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation and uphold me with a free spirit” cries the psalmist, and this is just what Christ’s revelation of God accomplishes for the soul that believes Him. Don’t worry about the suitability of your words or language or requests, just pour out your soul with the freedom that is the privilege of one beloved. Lay your heart bare for God to sift and judge. Prayer at its best means living with mind and heart utterly open to God.

A maidservant once came to the Bishop of London

to ask his advice, her great difficulty being that she could not find words to form a prayer. She did not know what to say. With truly Christian simplicity the Bishop advised her to make her difficulty the burden of her prayer. "Tell God about it," was his advice. It is a sound recommendation. If we took our difficulties to Him, appealing from the clouds that are about His throne to Him who sitteth above the clouds, they would trouble us far less. May we pray for this or that, we continually ask? "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," is the apostolic reply. As Professor Bowne has said, "To pray about everything, in submission to God's will, would be both more human and more Christian than a scrupulous limitation of our prayer to what we might think permissible subjects of petition." "Perfect love casteth out fear," the fear that is craven and nervous, the fear that has torment; but the fear that is reverence, love perfectly preserves. So be not in bondage to any one posture in prayer, or to the use either of "written" or "free" prayers, but seek those circumstances of prayer which help your soul the most. Love will show the way and will never lapse from good taste.

3. God is holy. The emphasis of Jesus upon righteousness is all too frequently overlooked in prayer. He, the gentlest of prophets, has unveiled for us more vividly than any other, the spotless whiteness of God's attire. Therefore He demands "truth in the inward parts." It is of little use to pray unless we are first reconciled to our brother. The praying soul must be without hate and free of every impure desire. It must be utterly in earnest and really want that for which it pleads. The deeds we do, the life we lead, are part of our praying, for they affect the prevailing efficacy of

our prayers. It is the pure in heart that see God. Thus in Christian prayer utter freedom is combined with cleanness of life. So, moreover, the prayer of word tends to become the prayer of work, and an exquisite balance and proportion is obtained between the inner and the outer life.

Finally the realization of God's holiness will serve to assure us of the justice and wisdom and goodness behind His refusal of any request, and so the sting of unanswered petition is removed or at least lessened. The intensity of God's love, which, crudely apprehended, might betray us into a lazy dependence on His provision, is seen to be balanced and filled out by His most marvelous strength, and we realize that love has its sterner side which for love's sake must be satisfied. So we are led unto the supreme prayer and kneel with our Saviour in Gethsemane crying, "Nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done." If, too, we meditate upon this application of Christ's revelation of God to the practice of praying, we find that there is really no problem besetting the subject which is not met by accepting Jesus as the truth about God.

WHITEFIELD'S, LONDON, ENGLAND.

PHILO ON INSPIRATION

By R. BIRCH HOYLE

"No MAN hath beheld God at any time," said Jesus; yet in their best moments men have ever had the desire to get behind the veil of things that appear, in their ceaseless quest after the real and abiding—after God. Modern Spiritism, such as London presents today in those gathered about Sir Conan Doyle, the man of letters, testifies to this deep-seated craving. Students of the old world know how the age immediately preceding the appearance of Jesus on earth was full of these wistful quests after the unseen world.

Philo of Alexandria was one who gave himself to this search. How can man, a creature compounded of a material nature and an immaterial, come to a knowledge of what lies behind and beyond matter? This was the problem he sought to solve. He had to his hand a comprehensive view of "spirit" which, to his mind, answered the question. "Spirit" was the warm air which gave vitality and force to living creatures. It was also the moving cause which produced thought in the human mind and lifted man in value above all other living things on earth. It was the connecting medium, the *tertium quid*, which came from God to men and joined them onto God. Man's mind, in Philo's view, "is a bit of God Himself, a colony transplanted from His happy and blessed nature." Philo claims that the Spirit of God comes to men under certain conditions and enables them to obtain the "beatific vision," the sight of God. In a previous paper the various views of

“spirit” in the physical, physiological, and psychological life of man were described as Philo conceived it; in this paper the inspirational work of the divine Spirit, is our chief theme. We shall ascertain: (1) Who, in Philo’s view, have this experience; (2) what the experience means; (3) how far it was Philo’s own; and (4) how it compares with the Christian experience of the Spirit of God, as Paul knew it.

1. *Who are inspired?* Philo regards this experience as the highest form of knowledge available to man. “Truly splendid is the prize,” he says, “to be equipped with eyesight so as to perceive without dimness Him who is alone worthy of contemplation” (*De Mutatione Nominum* 82, Cohn & Wendland). Philo thinks every man, by creation, is entitled to this vision. “Every man, as touching his intellect [Greek, *dianoian*], is inhabited by a divine word and is a copy or fragment or off-raying of His blessed nature” (*De Opificio Mundi*, cap. 51). This came to pass at the creation of mankind in Adam, for “the inbreathing [Gen. 2:7] was nothing else but divine Spirit sent forth for the profit of our race,” and is “the most like God within the soul” (*De Opif. Mund.*, cap. 46; *De Plantatione Noe* 5). In other words, the basis of human nature in its higher aspect is akin to the divine. This is the foundation for the subsequent experience of “inspiration.”

But then not all men appear to enjoy this vision. How comes it that the general host of mankind have lost it? Taking as his text Genesis 6:3 (LXX), “My spirit shall not forever *abide* in these men because they are flesh,” Philo argues that “the greatest cause of ignorance is the flesh and making friends with the flesh.” He touches a human chord when he adds: “Yet marriage and the rearing of children and the furnishing of

necessary things and the drabness joined to lack of money and business life, public and private, and a host of other things make the flower of wisdom droop before it begins to blossom vigorously" (*De Gigantibus* 7).

And yet, despite these worldly concerns, to all men, even to the slaves of pleasure, he thinks there come visits of the divine Spirit. "For very often, even over the most polluted and accursed beings, there hovers a sudden appearance of the all-good God. But they are unable to take hold of it and keep it among them, for almost immediately it quits its former place and departs, rejecting those . . . to whom it never would have come if it had not been for the purpose of convicting those who prefer the shameful to the good." (*De Gigant.* 5.) Here Philo is quite close to the thought of the Fourth Gospel, the Spirit convicts "in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment" (16:8). "At times," he adds, "the Spirit does remain, but not for ever and ever amongst the majority of us."

Nevertheless, in his opinion, there are souls which "remain undisturbed in the theater of the universe, occupied in seeing and hearing divine things," souls like Abraham, Moses, and Bezaleel, to whom moments of illumination are granted, when "they see into the heart of things" and gain a vision of God. In a passage which recalls to mind Hebrews 11:16, "They desire a better country, a heavenly," he says. "In reality, every soul of a wise man has Heaven for its country and takes earth as a foreign land, and considers the house of Wisdom as its home, but the house of the body a lodging-house in which it proposes to dwell but a little while" (*De Agricultura* 14). Such souls are the true aristocrats of earth, "born of God, priests and prophets with no ambition to be citizens of the world but, rising beyond

the whole world of the senses, they have removed into the spiritual world, become residents and have their names enrolled in the commonwealth of incorruptible and incorporeal ideas" (*De Gigant.* 13; cf. *Heb.* 12:22 f.).

Two conditions must be fulfilled by men in order to obtain the divine vision, freedom from the thralldom of the flesh, and the grace of a unified and recollected mind. The first of these two conditions is illustrated from the life of the patriarch Abraham. On *Genesis* 15:5, "God led him forth," Philo says: "The mind that is about to be led forth is required to depart in freedom from all bodily needs, from the sensual organs, from sophistical arguings, from suasive words and, lastly, from itself. For it is impossible for the soul, whilst dwelling in a body and amid a mortal race, to gain kinship with God, but God breaks the fetters of the prison house [*i.e.*, the body] for it." (*De Legum Allegoriarum* iii, 13 f.)

The second condition, that of the unified mind, is seen in the case of Moses. It was "because Moses was a being of the most tranquil habits, either standing still or sitting still [alluding to *Deut.* 5:31; *Ex.* 18:14], and not at all disposed by nature to subject himself to turns and changes, that the divine spirit of wisdom remained a long time with him." And he continues: "The divine Spirit remains among one sort of men alone, viz., those who have stripped off all creaturely things and the inmost veil and covering of false opinion, and like Moses, have 'fixed their tent' [*Ex.* 33:7], *i.e.*, settled their mind steadily before beginning to worship God" (*De Gigant.* 11:12). As the Psalmist enjoins, "Be still and know that I am God" (46:10).

But the search is not alone on the side of man; God also desires to approach man as well. "God, by reason

of his love of man [Gr., *philanthrōpia*] did not turn aside from the soul [of Abraham] as it came to Him, but He went forth to meet it and revealed His nature, in so far as it is possible for the beholder to see it. Hence it is said, not that he [Abraham] *saw* God, but that God *appeared* to him." (*De Migratione Abrahami* 79 CW.) "God, by reason of His gracious nature, goes forth to meet . . . and reveal Himself to those who crave to behold Him" (*De Fuga* 141 CW.). The self-disclosure of God to men is thus conditioned by the capacity of the beholder to receive revelation. This explains why there are different degrees of revelation. Bezaleel, for instance, is at a lower grade than Moses. Philo uses the figure of the seal or coin, itself merely a copy of an original, to account for the craftsman's skill (*cf.* Ex. 35:30-35). God stamped the figure of the tabernacle upon Bezaleel's soul, after the fashion of a genuine coin; that is, by a medium and not directly as from Himself. This immediate contact, however, is the higher stage, peculiar to Moses among the prophets. This latter kind of revelation is "a more perfect and more highly purified kind, initiated into the great mysteries," which "passes beyond created objects and grasps the Great Uncreated through Himself."

Philo then takes up the impassioned prayer of Moses in Exodus 33:13 (LXX), "Show thyself to me that I may consciously see thee," and expounds it thus: "For not by shadows, such as the secondary means of sky or earth or water or air or anything made, be Thou pleased to manifest Thyself, nor let the reflection of Thyself be mirrored in anything else but in Thyself, O God." And the reason given is "because the images presented in things made" are as fleeting as the water or materials reflecting them and the Great First Cause cannot be

clearly seen in any of His works. Bezaleel and the prophets generally only see the "shadow" of God, but "Moses speaks face to face with God 'in person' and not darkly" (*De Leg. Alleg.* iii, 31-33; on Num. 12:6, LXX; cf. Paul's use of the figure of the mirror, 1 Cor. 13:12; 2 Cor. 3:18).

Thus Philo came to believe "that all that stands written in the sacred books [the first five, the Law] are divine oracles." He even groups them at varying levels of inspiration. "Of these sacred utterances some were spoken by God in person, using His divine prophet as interpreter. Some were revealed as the result of question and answer, and some were announced by Moses in person in a state of divine inspiration and possession." (*De Vita Mosis* iii, 23 f.) He does not hesitate to say that the work of the translators of the Hebrew into Greek is as infallible as the original, for they "were not so much translators as hierophants and prophets, seeing that it was given them by unmixed thoughts to coincide with the perfectly pure spirit of Moses."

2. *The experience of the beatific vision.* Philo is careful to explain that God has not a human form and consequently it is not by physical eyes, but "by the eye of the soul," that God is seen. Like sees like, and "the spirit of man" is that in man which enables him to pass beyond the bounds of matter and "see Him that is invisible." "The mind," he says, "is invisible, yet sees all else; its own essence cannot be manifested, though it can grasp the essences of all other things." It can pass through land and sea, exploring everything; it can rise up "with wings as eagles" and get caught up "in the choral dance of the spheres"—"Sun, moon and stars forgot," upward it flies. Aloft, the mind follows the perfect laws of music, has Love (Gr., *Eros*) for its guide,

and passes into the spiritual world beyond the world of sense perception. It becomes drunk with a sober intoxication and is divinely filled with another desire until it seems to be approaching the Great King Himself. While it is eagerly longing to behold Him there streams forth upon it a cascade of pure and unmixed beams "of divine light in the dazzling radiance of which the eyes of the mind grow dim" (*De Opif. Mund.* 23). In Milton's phrase, it is "dark with excess of bright."

The figure of light is often used by Philo to describe the state of vision. "It is a bright incorporeal ray," he tells us, "purer than ether . . . hard to behold, for the splendor of the rays obscures the soul's vision. Then the Father and Saviour, pitying her in her extraordinary craving for a vision, imparts power to the approach of her sight and does not withhold the vision of Himself, so far as a created and mortal nature can sustain it." This impartation of power is the act of inspiration; what is seen is revelation. Philo asks, "Can we behold the sense-perceived sun by any other means than the sun itself? . . . Is not light seen by means of light? So God, who is His own sunny radiance, is seen through Himself alone, no other working with Him or being able to as regards the pure apprehension of His existence." (*De Praemiis et Poenis* 37 ff.; 45. CW.)

In the descriptions of "the light that was never on land or sea, the consecration and the poet's dream," as Wordsworth styles it, we have reminiscences of Philo's readings in Plato as well as in the Law of Moses. The flight of the soul above this world of time and space recalls the vision of the gods in their chariot in the *Phaedrus* (247 ff.); the dance and music of the spheres, with love leading on, re-echoes the song of the soul enamored of beauty and love in the *Symposium*

(211 ff.). Thus the loftiest experiences of Greek genius and of Hebrew inspiration are blended together with the greatest skill. The thought is very close to Paul's great verse: "The only Potentate . . . dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto: whom no man hath seen or can see" (1 Tim. 6:15 f.).

The emotional reaction to this "vision splendid" is described in terms of the influence of intoxicants, and is most interesting as one of the first attempts at a psychological analysis of the state of "inspiration." "Whatever soul is filled with grace is at once in a state of exaltation and delight and dancing. For it becomes full of triumph so that it would appear to many to be intoxicated and agitated and to be beside itself. . . . For in the case of those who are under the influence of divine inspiration, not only is the soul wont to be excited, and as it were, become frenzied, but the body also is wont to become ruddy and of a fiery hue. The joy which is internally diffused and which is exultant, spreads secretly its affections even to the external [bodily] parts; by this many thoughtless persons have been deceived and have fancied that sober persons were intoxicated. And yet, indeed, sober folk are in a manner intoxicated, having drunk deep of all good things." (*De Ebrietate* 36.)

This passage throws light upon New Testament experiences of the Holy Spirit, such as the Saviour's exultant joy, the Pentecostal experience of being filled with the Spirit—in place of wine, and the "joy of the Holy Ghost" (*cf.* Luke 10:21; Acts 2:13-15; Ephes. 3:18; 1 Thess. 1:6). The Greek of the first of those passages is exceedingly close to another reference in Philo: "The human spirit glows like a fiery coal [Gr., *anthrax*] kindled into a flame of thanksgiving to God

and becoming drunken with that drunkenness which does not intoxicate" (*De Leg. Alleg.* i, 26).

More frequently Philo borrows language from pagan notions of "inspiration" to describe what occurs. There was a rich terminology at his service, which can hardly be represented in the English language: "Enthusiasm" (lit. "having a god within one"), "divine seizure," "being possessed by deity," "being carried off by the god" (*cf.* the "rapture" of Ganymede in mythology), "being swept by Heavenly passion," "to be rapt in frenzy," and even "to be divinely mad," often meet us in Philo. Here the leading nuance is, that the control of the will has been removed because the person has been invaded, captured, and dominated by the incoming Spirit. As an expressive colloquialism in English puts it, the person is "out of his mind," or, as the Biblical phrase runs, respecting Jesus and Paul, he is "beside himself" (*cf.* Mark 3:21; 2 Cor. 5:13).

Two brief passages, out of many, elucidate this experience. "If a yearning come upon thee to have share in the divine blessedness . . . escape [lit. "run off"] from thyself, get ecstasized from thyself in a Bacchic frenzy, and become divinely inspired like those who are possessed and filled with Corybantic delirium." In Philo's opinion the prophets were in that state when they received their messages. "With the prophetic kind the divine Spirit loves to consort. For the mind in us leaves home at the coming of the divine Spirit and at the removal of the latter enters its house again. For it is not right for the mortal to dwell with the immortal. Therefore the setting of the sun of reason takes place and the encircling darkness begets ecstasy and being carried off by the divine mania" (*Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres Sit* 69 f.; 249. CW.). "For truly the

prophet," he concludes, "even when he appears to speak is really silent, while Another uses his organs of speech, his mouth and tongue, to declare His will."

It follows inevitably from such a view of inspiration that the prophet is little more than a record on a phonograph, or, to use Philo's figure, an instrument swept by the divine hand. As he says elsewhere: "A prophet gives forth nothing of his own, but acts as interpreter at the prompting of another in all that he proclaims, continuing in a state of ignorance all the time he is divinely possessed. For his reason has removed and withdrawn from the citadel of the soul where the divine Spirit has come to dwell; the divine Spirit the while producing sound in the entire mechanism of the voice so as clearly to reveal that which he prophesieth." (*De Specialibus Legibus* iv, 8.)

This mechanical theory of inspiration, to give it the technical name, has had a long career within the Christian church. A century after Philo we meet it in Justin Martyr who wrote that "the divine Spirit acts on just men as a plectrum on a harp or lyre" (*Corhortatio ad Graecos* 8). Athenagoras and Hippolytus used the same expression (*cf. Legatio pro Christianis* 9; *De Antichristo* 2). Tertullian's view of inspiration is the same, and its final form was given when Buxtorf, in the seventeenth century, echoing Philo's literal inspiration theory, applied to translating Scripture, declared that the consonants and even vowel points in the Hebrew of the Old Testament were also inspired by the Holy Ghost. Advocates of that theory seldom realize that its origin is pagan and not Christian.

Such a view, to quote the late Bishop Westcott, "is destructive of all that is holiest in man and highest in religion which seeks the co-ordinate elevation of all our

faculties and not the destruction of any one of them. . . . The prophet ceases to be a man while he is affected by the phrensy of the heathen seers." (*Introduction to Study of the New Testament*, ed. 8, p. 6.) Nobler is the dynamic view of inspiration, which sees the intensification and enhancement of the conscious powers of the prophets when subject to the influence of the Holy Spirit. As Phillips Brooks used to say, "It is truth divine through and *plus* human personality."

When we pass from the method of inspiration and revelation to ask what the "eye of the soul" sees at the moment of the beatific vision we are left in the dark. For all our words are borrowed from this world of time and space, and God dwells above it and is pure unity. Like all mystics, Philo can only say that what is seen cannot be told in human speech. Yet the mind of the beholder is not so blank as Philo would have us think. In his own case we can see that he brought with him the fruits of his wide reading in Greek philosophy, and this often trammels his modes of thought when, as a Hebrew, his religious feelings are in full exercise. But we should be wrong if we thought of him simply as an extensive borrower from Hellenism for his expressions of the mystic vision. He himself had personal acquaintance with God, and to this we now turn.

3. *Philo's experience of inspiration.* At one place in his writings Philo incidentally says that "the invisible Spirit . . . is wont to speak to me in whispers," and in another reference that "suddenly an obscure point of interpretation was cleared up by my own soul which is accustomed frequently to be divinely-laid-hold-of" (*De Somniis* ii, 38; *De Cherubim* 9). This experience, he says, was his "countless times." In a lengthy passage, which we cut short, he tells us: "I am not ashamed to

narrate my own experience. Often when proposing to enter upon my usual task of writing on philosophical doctrines . . . I have found my mind barren and fruitless. But at other times when I had come empty, all of a sudden I was filled with thoughts showered down like snowflakes and sown upon me unseen from above, so that by divine possession I fell into a trance and became ignorant of everything, of where I was, who was present, even of myself and what was spoken or written. For I received a stream of interpretation, a fruition of light, the clearest distinctness of vision, the most vividly distinct view of the subject before me, such as the eyes might get by the most luminous presentation of an object" (*De Migrat. Abr.* 7).

This snowing down of ideas upon the mind is not confined to religious meditation; it can be paralleled in literature and in other arts. From the sphere of music Mozart's experience can be taken: "When and how my ideas come I know not, nor can I force them. . . . My subject enlarges itself, becomes methodized and defined, and the whole, though it be long, stands almost complete and finished in my mind so that I can survey it like a fine picture or a beautiful statue at a glance. Nor do I hear in my imagination the parts successively, but I hear them, as it were, all at once. The actual hearing of the whole together is . . . perhaps the best gift I have my Divine Master to thank for." (*Holmes, Life and Correspondence of Mozart*, p. 317.)

We may not tarry to indicate the modern psychological explanation of this "uprush of the subliminal consciousness" which Philo so finely describes. But such an "inflow" is no guarantee of divine inspiration; the test is not in the copiousness of that flow, or the strangeness of the experience, but in the actual content and

quality of the ideas received. It is significant that Philo dwells on the "stream of interpretation" conveyed, and this accords with his view of prophecy, as consisting in interpretation of what the mind is supposed to have received when in the ecstatic state. This results in his attempts to find hidden meanings behind plain words—his fondness for allegory—which can make Scripture mean anything or nothing as one chooses and makes much of Philo's writings wearisome to read.

4. *The Philonic and Pauline experience of the Spirit compared.* The main points of Philo's view may be put thus: There is no abiding influence of the Spirit in this view of inspiration. Even in the supreme instance of Moses the Spirit is but a transitory guest. The supersession of the human consciousness when in the divine Presence is a grave blemish. There are transports of feeling, but there is given little food for the mind. And the idea of God which Philo acquires is left vague and misty. At these points we may profitably compare Philo and Paul.

The Pauline teaching of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost would have shocked Philo. "It is improper for the mortal to dwell with the immortal; it is impossible for a created being to bear God in itself"; these are fundamental *dicta* of Philo's which leave no room for the distinctive Christian experience. How different it is with Paul! "The Spirit of God dwells in you"; "If a man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his"; "Your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit in you." All this would have sounded profane in Philo's ears. And so he could not have entertained Paul's thought of the Spirit's ethical co-operation with believers in their fight against the passions and lusts of the flesh. To "walk by the Spirit," to "live by the Spirit," means to

Paul the continuous presence of the Spirit with men, just because they are men, sinful and mortal, and need divine aid.

The access to God which Philo knew was a brief, fugitive experience. With Paul the direct contact with God, "the practice of the presence of God," was the regular routine of his everyday life. It is the conscious, constant intercourse of a son with his Heavenly Father. The inspiration which follows this intercourse issues in a perception of the vast world-wide, age-long plans and purposes of God, the conviction that the human life has been caught up into the mighty sweep and range of the divine government of the world, and that the individual life is charged through and through with divine power and adequate to every emergency, because indwelt by the Holy Spirit of God. Prophecy, to Paul, is creative and more than merely interpretative. It does not lose itself in the sands of fanciful parallelisms, double meanings, hairsplitting niceties; it is the creative Word of God by which worlds are made and the Roman Empire can be remolded nearer "to the heart's desire" of God stooping to redeem His lost children. The philosopher, on the other hand, still remains the proud aristocrat, the Pharisee, conscious that the illumination granted to him is what separates him from "the vulgar mob that knows not the Law."

The cessation of the reason in the ecstatic emotional flight of the soul was, to Paul, puerile. "Brothers," he says, "be not children in your minds, but become grown-up men" (1 Cor. 14:20). It was the Hellenic, Philonic, view of inspiration which Paul put in its due place when he wrote 1 Corinthians, chapters 12-14. The reverie and abandon, so dear to Philo, Paul knew quite well; but he taught that it must be put under the control of

the mind. "I will pray with my spirit and I will pray with my mind: I will sing with my spirit and I will sing also with my mind," says the Apostle, and adds roundly, "In church I would rather speak five words with my mind, that I may instruct others, than ten thousand in a tongue." With such words Paul stamps, not only the Philonic expression, but all pagan theories of inspiration, as inferior in degree and worth to the specific experience common to all Christian believers. For the Apostle is ever concerned to lay the emphasis on "knowing"; that is, the active exercise of the mind, led, indwelt, renewed by the Spirit, as it seeks to understand the mind of God. As he says explicitly, "We received the Spirit who is from out of God [Gr., *ek*] in order that we might know the things graciously bestowed upon us by God" (1 Cor. 2:12). Paul would have subscribed to John Milton's view of Christian learning, which is "to repair the ruins of our first parents by regaining to know God aright, and out of that knowledge to love Him, to imitate Him, to be like Him" (*On Education*, par. 2).

In fairness to Philo it must be said that the material through which the Spirit's revelation was made to him was less ample than in Paul's case. The five books of the Law supplied but dark outlines—"shadows" is Philo's pet word—of the divine nature. But with Paul those shadows, growing clearer through the ages, became plain in outline as "the body of Christ," "in whom dwelt all the fulness of Godhead bodily" (Col. 2:10, 17). Philo never knew God in Christ, and there was the one added revelation which made all the difference in the world. It made the Old Testament a new book, for it gave the clue to its meaning and the standard by which it might be measured. In Luther's vigorous language, "That is the proper test by which to judge all books—

whether they preach Christ, since all Scripture manifests Christ. . . . That which does not preach Christ is not apostolic." (Preface to German Bible.)

There was not, nor could there be, any "Gospel" in Philo's view of God. He is not to be blamed for that; he could but give what he had. "God is not even comprehensible to the intellect," says Philo, "except merely as to His essence; for His existence, indeed, is a fact which we do comprehend concerning Him, but beyond the fact of His existence, we can understand nothing" (*Quod Deus Sit Immutabilis* 13). That God is, is patent to all who reflect on the order and design of the universe; but *what* God is requires that further and fuller revelation which came to Paul in and through Christ. Philo stops at a bare theism, and in that there is not enough for heart and mind. He stood where Paul was at Romans 1:20, where the eternal power and godhead were manifest in the works of nature; he could not pass on to Romans 5:2, to "the access by faith into this grace in which we stand." For he knew not of "God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto them their trespasses," or of the blissful state of the forgiven, redeemed soul conscious that "there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (2 Cor. 5:19; Rom. 8:1 ff.).

And so Philo's knowledge of God is vague and shadowy, and his experience of God, real and true though it be, is not so rich, lasting, and continuous as that which the humblest believer may have when "the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge" of God enables him to "know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints" (Eph. 1:17 f.).

Here we must end. Philo is an example for all of

us in his unwearied use of the little Scripture he possessed. His experience of God was real; he was "a seeker after God" and, in measure, was found of Him. His experience of the divine Spirit places him among the mystics and leaves us desiring more, and, in the mercy of God, that more has come to us in and through the sending of His Son, with the subsequent sending of the Holy Spirit. Through the Word the Spirit still speaks to those who will listen; the voice of God can be heard as it tells of a Father's love. The veil grows thin, and "the illumination of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" shines through. The Spirit-visited soul then knows the truth of the Saviour's word, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." This is the "beatific vision" that satisfies the soul evermore. Then it braces itself for the apostolic task of communicating its message to others. It sings:

I feel the winds of God today,
Today my sail I lift,
Though heavy oft with drenching spray
And torn with many a rift,

If hope but light the water's crest,
And Christ my bark will use,
I'll seek the seas at His behest
And brave another cruise. . . .

If cast on shores of selfish ease
Or pleasure I should be,
Lord let me feel Thy fresh'ning breeze,
And I'll put back to sea.

[*New Scottish Hymnary* 528.]

THE PROBLEM OF ITALIAN EDUCATION

By PROFESSOR ALFREDO TAGLIALATELA, D.D.

I WONDER how many of my readers are acquainted with the name of Francesco De Sanctis, the great historian of Italian literature. He was one of the most forceful promoters of the Neapolitan revolution in 1848 against the government of the Bourbons branded by Gladstone as "the negation of God." He suffered years of imprisonment and exile. After the constitution of the new kingdom he became a minister of the Crown and one of the leading minds in Italian politics.

But his supreme achievement was the *History of Italian Literature*, which he wrote between the years 1869 and 1871. In this great work he condensed the results of an entire life spent in meditation and teaching this subject. His knowledge is extensive and first-hand; his thought is vigorous and deep; his style reminds one of Tacitus. In the realm of literary criticism nothing has ever been published in Italy or elsewhere that is more comprehensive and constructive. Without losing himself in biographical details of criticism, he always goes directly to the center of the literary work he is examining, grasps it, separates and determines its constituent elements, and then reconstructs the entire work according to the mind of the author, assigning to it its particular value. There are several histories of Italian literature by Italian or other European authors, but this one of De Sanctis is not to be confused with any of them, so conspicuous is its originality.

When it was published it made an immense impres-

sion on the educated classes; then, on account of the turning of the materialistic tide and the prevalence of the so-called historical criticism, it was to some extent set aside. But it was soon rescued from its semi-oblivion. Benedetto Croce, who is proud to be called a disciple of De Sanctis, dedicated a large amount of his literary work to a complete edition of the writings of De Sanctis, published or unpublished. The result of this has been, besides the new light thrown upon the figure of this fine thinker, an impressive revival of the method and principles of his criticism. All the cultured classes in Italy today draw abundantly from the living spring of the thought of that great master.

A statement that frequently occurs in De Sanctis' *Storia della Letteratura Italiana* is this, that the decadence of Italian education began when Italy deliberately closed its doors to the Protestant Reformation and surrendered to the decrees of the Council of Trent. That was the time, De Sanctis says, when the populations of Europe struggled to organize themselves into nations, each fortified and cemented together by its own religious and moral ideals. Italy was able neither to rise into a nation, nor to keep her independence from other nations and her influence upon the world. Indeed, he adds, while the Council of Trent helped to stop the impudent immorality of the priests, and so appeased the bitterest accusers against the church, at the same time it reinforced the papal authority at the expense of the episcopacy, transforming hierarchy into an absolute monarchy, defining authoritatively the dogmas and denying the competence of individual reason and conscience.

The scission between Italy and the other nations, where the Reformation had partially or wholly suc-

ceeded, was complete. On one side was liberty of conscience and competence of human reason in the interpretation of the Bible and in the entire field of theology; on the other side the branding as heresy, not only specific dogmatic statements, but the claim to the right itself of making any. Political liberty prospered on the one side, while on the other the throne was proclaimed as inviolable as the altar, and the maxim was, *De Deo parum, de rege nihil*. The moral character of the individual grew stronger in the Protestant countries, while in Italy the educated classes learned both dissimulation and skepticism and the clergy became hypocritical. As for the plebeians, they were left in their happy stupidity by the superior classes that by so doing thought to promote their own interests.

New religious orders arose, Theatines, Somaschians, Barnabites, the Fathers of the Oratory, and the Jesuits, all dedicating themselves principally to the education of youth. With what results? Besides withholding Italy from participating in the great questions that agitated all Europe, involving the future of civilization, Catholic education cut the main arteries of the Italian mind. Italian literature lost its vigor and became simply a mechanical and lifeless imitation of the old classics, interested only in verbal expression. In that time England had Shakespeare; France, Rabelais and Montaigne, both rich in Italian reminiscences; Spain and Portugal had Cervantes and Camoens; but Italy was crowded out by pedants and rhetoricians. She had Torquato Tasso, the author of the *Gerusalemme Liberata*; but it is this same epic that offers us the most concrete example of the spiritual inferiority then afflicting the Italian people. In fact the religion professed by the heroes of Tasso is anything but a living religion. They

go to church, recite prayers, confess their sins to the priests, hold processions, attend mass, cross themselves abundantly, but it ends there—formalism, nothing else.

Neither did Tasso succeed in making a truly religious epic when he transformed the *Gerusalemme Liberata* into the *Gerusalemme Conquistata*. He changed verses, descriptions, and episodes; but the essential character of his work remained the same. One cannot put a religious spirit into a work of art by the mere wish to do so. When you put alongside the *Gerusalemme Liberata* Milton's *Paradise Lost* or Klopstock's *Messias*, both vibrating with a truly religious spirit, you have the most evident proof of the catastrophe of Italian education. Marino, Chiabrera, Filicaia, the poets who followed Tasso, resembled him, although he felt the tragedy of that catastrophe and they did not. To them literature is something conventional and lifeless, a game of words without earnestness and frivolous even when it pretends to be solemn.

It is true that in the seventeenth century science flourished in Italy. It was the time of Galileo, Torricelli, Castelli, Cavalieri, Borelli, Viviani, and many others; also the time of the founding of the two great academies, dei Lincei and del Cimento, for scientific research, which were the models for the subsequent Royal Society in England, the Académie des Sciences in France, and the Berlin Academy. But the Italian scientists were forbidden to go beyond the realm of pure observation or to construct any advanced theory from them. Galileo was forced to retract the doctrine of the motion of the earth, and the others had to be so prudent in making anything of their wonderful observations that their pupils from other countries took advantage of the situation and, like Harvey, who had studied at Padua

University, published as their own the discoveries of these great masters. No less unfortunate were the philosophers. Telesio, called by Bacon the first of the new men, died peacefully in his bed, but Campanella was thrown into a dungeon for twenty-seven years, and Bruno was burned. The same fate pursued the religious reformers. The most fortunate were those who fled the country, like the Socini.

Everyone knows that the doctrines of the Italian scientists, philosophers, and reformers were seeds of great harvests in the countries where they took refuge; but in Italy the seeds, like the men, were for a long time suppressed by the dominating power of the Jesuits. Instead of uplifting men towards science, morality, and the Gospel, this society lowered the standards to the level of men. Some of the followers of Loyola were clever scientists, and even advocates of the principle of popular sovereignty. But their ultimate aim was to use the people against the princes in order to subdue both to the absolute authority of the Pope. As they nearly always succeeded in having the Pope in their power the final result was their management of the entire Italian life. While other nations were struggling for political independence and religious freedom and realizing both, in Italy all was subdued under the Jesuitical policy, especially thought. The Catholic restoration had triumphed, Italy was isolated from progressive Europe.

In Quick's *Educational Reformers* there is a criticism of the educational system of the Jesuits that coincides with the judgment by De Sanctis. "The Jesuits," says Quick, "did not aim at developing all the faculties of their pupils but merely the receptive and reproductive faculties. When the young man had acquired a thor-

ough mastery of the Latin language for all purposes, when he was well versed in the theological and philosophical opinions of his preceptors, when he was skillful in dispute and could make a brilliant display from the resources of a well stored memory, he had reached the highest point to which the Jesuits sought to lead him. Originality and independence of mind, love of truth for its own sake, the power of reflecting and of forming correct judgments were not merely neglected—they were suppressed by the Jesuit system.”

All of these statements, which I have gathered almost literally from the *Storia della Letteratura Italiana* by De Sanctis, prove that he firmly believed Italian culture began to decline when the schools were left in the hands of the clergy. Sometimes the author regards the second event as directly the cause of the first; at other times he confines himself to coupling the two events and seems to attribute both to the *Zeitgeist*. I may add that all the Italian historians, including Cantù, a strongly prejudiced Catholic, have noted the simultaneity of the two facts, although not all agree in considering the second as caused by the first.

These conditions lasted throughout the entire eighteenth century. Great men like Vico and Giannone lived during this century and proved the irrepressible power of Italian genius; but Vico was not understood and Giannone suffered persecution. In the schools, all in the hands of the clergy, originality in any subject continued to be frowned upon and suppressed if possible. Although magnificently organized from a technical standpoint, like the Royal Academy of Turin which was later chosen by Napoleon as a model for the reorganization of educational institutions in France, the schools were lacking in moral efficiency. This is prin-

cipally proved by the teaching of the classical languages. It should have put the hearts of the young students in close touch with the great characters of ancient Greece and Rome, transfusing within them some of their austerity, courage, and love for liberty. The Jesuits instead succeeded in teaching Greek and Latin in such a way that the moral influence of the classics was annihilated, and the main sources of moral energy that the world knew before the Gospel became nothing else than miserable repertories of words and grammatical rules. The key whereby the study of classical languages would have offered the younger generations the opportunity of opening the doors of the ideals of the ancient world was wantonly hidden. In just the same way another key, that of the interpretation of the Bible, had been hidden for centuries.

Nevertheless, in the latter half of the eighteenth century and in the early part of the nineteenth the seeds of the thought of Vico and Giannone began to flourish; in the case of Giannone more than in Vico, because the author of the *Storia Civile del Regno di Napoli* and of the *Triregno* had gathered an extraordinarily large number of facts demonstrating the injustice of the privileges of the church and of its intrusion into politics. Drowsy minds were awakened, not however to the extreme point of rebellion, because the princes governing Italy at that time—Charles III, Ferdinand IV, Maria Teresa, Joseph II, Leopold, and Charles Emanuel—granted reforms, and Pope Clement XIV himself abolished the Jesuits. Other great figures—Muratori, Beccaria, Filangieri, Genovesi, Gerdil, Galluppi, Gozzi, Goldoni, Verri, Baretti, Passeroni, Alfieri, Parini, and Foscolo—appeared in the field of history, law, philosophy, and literature. But they were only individual ex-

ceptions; the education given in the schools was, as previously, mechanical and formalistic. One has only to read Alfieri's description of his training in the Academy of Turin.

When, where, and how was Italy to face and solve the problem of education?

As to the time, it can be easily understood that it could never have happened before the destruction of the old political order and the unification of the country. This was begun, but not entirely completed, in 1860.

As to the place, a surprise awaits those who are not familiar with Italian history. The place where the new education appeared ready to begin its work, fully equipped for it, was Naples. What! Naples, that city which had been subjected to the worst of governments? Yes, Naples.

How Italy has sought to solve the problem I shall endeavor to show.

In the ancient University of Naples, once made famous by the names of Thomas Aquinas and Vico, there were still teaching masters of some reputation for learning and technical ability; but there, as elsewhere, education was like cramming the minds with information, not developing and strengthening them in order to acquire the power of thorough investigation and solid independent thinking. Besides this the students were treated with extreme rudeness. Although the time had passed when one could read on some of the street corners a municipal notice saying: "It is forbidden to all householders in this locality to rent rooms to prostitutes, students, and other dishonest people,"¹ yet the young people coming from various southern

¹Two of these inscriptions on stone, belonging to the seventeenth century, are still kept in St. Martin's Museum in Naples.

provinces of Italy to study in Naples were looked upon with suspicion. They had to have a permit for temporary residence in the city, obtainable only with great difficulty from the police, and were also compelled to belong to a religious congregation, and to have papers signed by the priests, certifying that they had participated in the sacraments. Such was the civil and religious training of the youth at that time.

From 1848 to 1860 it happened that, besides the official teaching given in the University, several private schools were opened, taking advantage of a restricted permission existing in the law. Nearly all of them were headed by men connected with the tradition of the best Italian thinkers as well as with Kant and Hegel, able to teach with that passion for the truth and that method of communicating it that were lacking in the official teaching. It is sufficient to say that Francesco De Sanctis was one of them. The rising generation was attracted to these institutions of learning like moths to the light. While the life of the University was steadily declining the private schools prospered.

When later on Italy became unified, Francesco De Sanctis was chosen by the government, following public opinion, to prepare a new educational plan for the schools of southern Italy. Never did a man set out to do his work with more energy than he. All the exceptional powers of his genius and character he employed for this gigantic undertaking, surrounding himself with the most willing and competent men. In the space of two or three days (October, 1860) he dismissed from the Neapolitan University no less than thirty-four professors, retaining only the most valuable and placing in the vacant chairs some who had distinguished themselves in private teaching. Consequently the University be-

came, if not as De Sanctis hoped, the most outstanding in Europe, at least one of them. New powerful voices resounded through the once dormant halls. Conflicting tendencies of thought were asserted through the mouths of masters equally competent to sustain their views and magnetic in their appeal to the youth of Italy.

Literature, history, law, mathematics, medicine, all the sciences of nature and mind, were in noble competition, pouring into the life of the young nation men well prepared to take their places and assume their own responsibilities. Particularly well equipped was the teaching in philosophy. The most representative figure in this department was Bertrando Spaventa, a Hegelian who considered Hegelism as a product of the thought of the philosophers of the Italian Renaissance. The mentality of the southern Italians is philosophical. The principal Italian philosophers, all three of the Renaissance, have been southerners. Therefore the Neapolitan youth took a deep and passionate interest in discussing the supreme problems.

This is not the place to sketch a history of the educational reform, nor of the part accomplished by De Sanctis and his successors. The work was both morally and technically complicated. First of all, it was necessary to model on a single plan all the Italian universities, which, having belonged to different states, differed very much, each being jealous of its own privileges and constitution. Then, too, they had to reorganize the preparatory schools, classical and technical, which from their number and the diversity in their curricula were in a state of chaos. Above all it was necessary to instil into the new scholastic organization a truly fervent educational spirit. This was the only way to realize the educational ideals proclaimed in the private schools and

by the masters of the *Risorgimento*, including Mazzini, Gioberti, and Rosmini. The time of criticizing the old system was past; it was time to rebuild.

It may be said that, considering all the circumstances, the young Kingdom of Italy accomplished this work with courage and regardless of sacrifices. The results however were minimized by several causes, some of which could have been eliminated if all De Sanctis' successors had been his equals; others were beyond the power of men, and therefore not removable.

One cause was the tendency to imitate servilely the German models. It can easily be understood that the reformers of the Italian school sought for examples and inspiration in the scholastic systems of other countries, and particularly of Germany, which at that time led in culture. But it is one thing to get inspiration from a model, and quite another thing to reproduce the model, mechanically. Unfortunately in this case the second procedure was followed. Insufficient stress was laid on the mental diversity existing between Germans and Italians. The textbook which serves admirably in teaching Latin or Greek grammar to a German boy does not serve the purpose equally well for an Italian boy. The latter can learn exactly the same things, but if they are presented to him in the German way, he will tire before deriving any benefit whatever. The same may be said of all the other subjects. There is a wide difference between the Italian and the German mind, as is proved by the types of music of these two peoples, the only ones that have created types of music entirely original. The reformers of the Italian schools made a great mistake when, instead of rationally adapting the German methods, they imposed them on the Italian students as a strait-jacket. It may be said in their

excuse that the work of adaptation would have taken time which the pressing circumstances did not permit. Anyway, we have pointed out the first cause of the incomplete success of the Italian scholastic reform.

Another cause was the wave of positivism which after the year 1860 invaded Italy as it did almost every other country in Europe. Positivism was a reaction against metaphysics and religion. Hegel had re-established the rights of both. According to his fundamental principle of the identification of the human mind with the absolute, the former can detect the latter either by way of concepts (metaphysics) or by way of symbols (religion). But positivism, born in France with Auguste Comte, considered metaphysics and religion as only imperfect stages through which the mind has to pass before attaining the real knowledge of things. Once the mind has arrived here it is no longer child or youth, but has reached its maturity; it does away with supernatural beings, beginning with God and with the abstract personified entities, and grasps the true reality that consists in facts and their relations. As is well known, Comte's doctrine—propagated by his eloquent disciples, Littré, Ribot, and Taine, more positivistic than their master, because they denied even the remnants of the grotesque mysticism which he had permitted to live—was aided in its diffusion through the world by the unexpected transformation of the Hegelian school. With the death of Hegel the compactness of his school had been shaken. Against its right wing and the center, that were conservative, the left wing rose. Feuerbach, Strauss, and others denied the personality of God, the immortality of the soul, the entire substance of the Christian revelation, and other metaphysical and religious conceptions held by the conservative party.

These negations crossed the Alps torrentially and flooded Italy. In a few years the Hegelian professors disappeared from their chairs; the philosophers of the *Risorgimento*, like Rosmini, Gioberti, and Mamiani, fell into oblivion; and as to the philosophers of the Renaissance, they were judged as nothing but premature positivists. Giordano Bruno, who had been essentially a mystic, became the waving red flag of the freethinkers, materialists, socialists, and all those who had found cause to attack the accepted order. It did not go this far in the schools; but from them teachers as well as students watched with smiling faces what was going on in the streets. I personally have sad recollections of these conditions. I was then in my college years. Brought up in a religious family and naturally inclined towards the religious interpretation of life, I was surrounded by teachers and fellow students almost all equally unbelieving. If in my essays I expressed my religious sentiments I would invariably meet with the sarcasm of my fellow students and the sympathetic compassion of my teachers.

Naturally, this destructive spirit, which had permeated the Italian school, cut off the work of reform. De Sanctis and his co-operators had dreamed of the end of an education through mere definitions and schemes which pretended to contain the infinite and divine reality of the universe; they had worked for the immediate contact of young minds with the greatest thoughts ever attained by men, and for an education that would create in the students' minds a sense of the greatness of man, of the solemnity of life, of individual responsibility. Instead, not these, but quite the opposite, were the characteristics of the education given in the Italian schools, except where the teachers reinforced the law.

The third cause which prevented the success of the reform was the abolition of religious teaching in the preparatory schools and of the departments of theology in the universities. In order to be fair with everyone we must admit that the reformers of education were partly compelled to take this drastic decision. Let us commence with the theological teaching in the universities. In countries where established churches exist the theological department in the universities serves to educate ministers for such churches. What purpose would they have served in Italy? For the preparation of ministers of the Catholic cult? The unification of Italy had been achieved against the wish of the church, which still kept a hostile attitude towards the new government and its institutions, to the point of forbidding faithful Catholics to take part in the political elections. The church had, and still has, its seminaries and required its ministers to be educated there and only there. Some indeed, considering that theological studies are important not only for practical preparation to the ministry but also for tracing the connection of theology with other branches of culture, advised that the departments of theology should be kept and an attempt made to create interest in the religious sciences among all students. But after many centuries of Italian history, during which theology had been a study exclusively reserved for the clergy, the laity had lost all interest in it.

On the other hand where were the professors to be found to fill these chairs? Professors from the clergy? If they were priests in good standing in the church which forbade liberal exegesis and higher criticism as well as all independent criticism of church history, what sort of theological science would they have taught? If they

were excommunicated priests, their teaching would have been a source of further friction between the young kingdom and the church. It was unnecessary to multiply causes of friction already too many. Or else, should they have assigned to these chairs of theology lay professors equal to the task of teaching theology as it was taught, let us say, in German universities? Then it would have been necessary to train such teachers, since there were none. Difficulties arose everywhere. So it is not surprising that in 1872 the Minister of Education extended to all the Italian universities the same measure which had already been taken for the University of Naples, that is, the abolition of the theological department.² There is a collection of the speeches delivered in Parliament on the occasion that led to the taking of such a decision. It is an exceedingly interesting book, even though fifty years have elapsed since these speeches were made.³

In the universities of Naples and Rome there were maintained two chairs in history of Christianity, held successively by Vera, Mariano, Chiappelli, Labanca, and Buonaiuti. With the exception of the latter, who was capable of drawing large audiences of students to his lectures, the others generally lectured in empty classrooms.

It is easy to understand the deplorable consequences for Italian culture which followed from the lack of a high theological training. Italy excluded itself from

² My father, Professor Pietro Tagliatela, who under the Bourbons had founded one of the private schools in Naples spoken of in the text, in which he occupied the chair in philosophy, was proposed by De Sanctis for a chair in the theological department in the University. He was officially appointed and had accepted, when, in 1861, the department was abolished. Then he was offered the chair of philosophy in Bologna and also in Milan, but refused.

³ The title is, *Discorsi pronunciati alla Camera dei Deputati nella discussione del progetto di legge per l'abolizione delle facoltà teologiche, nelle tornate del 25-30 aprile 1872, Roma, Botta ed. 1872.*

an extremely fertile and fruitful field of researches and debates. The young fell into the habit of considering theology as useless, fantastic or fanatic disquisitions, possessing no scientific character. The clergy attached itself more firmly than ever to the dogmas taught in the seminaries and lost the power of producing any critical work of value. Recently even Mussolini had occasion to state this fact when, in one of his orations in Parliament, he compared the sterility of the Italian clergy with the fertility of the French.

Even more disastrous than the abolition of the theological departments in the universities was the abolition of religious training in the secondary schools. Here also, in order to be just to the reformers of the scholastic law, we must admit that they had tremendous difficulties to face. To whom could the state entrust this teaching? To priests? Priests would have taken advantage of it to instil into the minds of the young anti-patriotic sentiments, as they were doing—as everyone knew—in their own confessional schools. To the teachers of literature or history? The great majority of these teachers did not have any religious faith; how could they be expected to teach that which they did not believe? So, rather than untie the knot of these difficulties, it was once more preferred to cut it; and another decree of abolition was issued. The consequences were more deplorable than in the previous case. Religious teaching can be done away with in the government schools if the children can get it through the religious denominations to which their families belong. But did the Italian families send their children to be instructed in the catechism or sacred history in the schools connected with the church? Perhaps you could have found one in a thousand. The church took no trouble along this line.

The result of all this was that our young students were well versed in Greek and Roman mythology, but absolutely ignorant of Old and New Testament history. When they read Dante or visited the art galleries they immediately understood any allusion to mythology but always needed an explanation whenever the Bible was alluded to. Even highly cultured people, who afterwards became speakers in Parliament or well known writers, regularly blundered whenever they quoted from the Bible. There exist anthologies of such blunders compiled by the magazines, edited by Italian Protestants, who were for some time the only ones to assert the value of religious culture.

Much more could be said on the causes which minimized the educational efficiency of the Italian schools. But I must hurry toward my conclusion.

The last ten years of the past century, in select and cultured circles in Italy, a feeling of dissatisfaction in regard to this state of affairs was manifested. But it was only during the Great War that a severe criticism of the methods of the schools was started and the sense of their insufficiency became general and acute. The Great War has been for Italy one of those events which go to the roots of a nation's life, giving it a new consciousness of its responsibilities as well as of its capabilities. Soon after the victory by which the Italian unification, begun in 1860, was completed, the scholastic reform was loudly demanded. The most powerful voice, gathering around itself all others, was that of Giovanni Gentile, heir of the spirit of Francesco De Sanctis and Bertrando Spaventa, the two most outstanding co-operators in the reform of 1860. When in 1922 Fascism took over the power, the Hon. Sig. Mussolini, with the quickness of intuition and of decision that distinguishes

him, did in this case also the right thing by calling Sig. Gentile to become Minister of Education. The reform outlined by Gentile went into effect the year after the event of Fascism, being the first Fascist reform. The fact is significant that Fascism, believed by many to be a wild movement, began its work of reorganizing Italy with the scholastic reform. Gentile's aims were:

1. To introduce religious teaching into government schools.
2. To entrust the teaching to men who thought of it, not as an occupation, but as a mission.
3. To substitute foreign textbooks for purely Italian ones.
4. To put pupils into direct contact with the works of the great masters and induce them to acquire a taste for them.
5. To offer to the private schools greater opportunities of co-operating with the government schools.

Naturally it requires time before such radical reforms can be carried out; it is not yet time to pronounce judgment. Gentile and his most able co-operators are exerting themselves to the utmost. The greatest difficulties they face are the lack of financial means, the backward mentality of some of the teachers, and the clergy. The clergy proclaimed itself satisfied with the re-establishment of religious teaching, but it seems incapable of considering it in the sense of the reform. The latter demands a vitalizing teaching, that would instil into the young the religious sense of life; while the clergy gives only a catechetical teaching, made up of dogmatic notions and aiming at impressing the young

with the greatness of the Roman Catholic Church and its superiority to everything else.

Should a breath of religious revival pass over Italy, all these difficulties would be solved. But as long as the clergy's mentality remains as it is, it is impossible to comprehend how it can co-operate with the state in education, either by its private schools or by assuming a part in the government's teaching. It is still the same clergy to whom, as De Sanctis said, "Italy owes the catastrophe of education in the sixteenth century."

W. H. Hudson *Indev*

ISRAEL—THE FULFILLMENT OF THE PROMISE

By REV. JOHN MURDOCH MACINNIS, D.Litt.

DO THE SCRIPTURES teach that the earthly Jerusalem is to be rebuilt, the temple, altars, priests, and sacrifices revived, and that Jesus Christ is coming back to restore the earthly throne of David and reign upon it as a Jewish king?

Many Christian teachers conscientiously and confidently answer that the Bible does foretell these things. They think this answer is the key to the Scriptures and that to deny it is to be untrue to the Word of God. There are a great many more, equally earnest and conscientious, and equally sincere in their acceptance of the Scriptures as the very Word of God, who believe that an adequate and fair interpretation of them as a whole results in a negative answer to our question. The history of Christian thought reveals that evangelical Christians until comparatively recent days have given the question a negative answer. The revival of a belief in a Jewish program, such as is naturally involved in an affirmative answer to the question, is most decidedly modern. This does not mean that being modern it must be necessarily wrong. No man or group of men have exhausted the treasures and final meanings of the Bible. When a new thought is humbly and earnestly set forth it is the solemn duty of Christians to receive it with an open mind and to search diligently the Scriptures to see whether these things be so or not.

This is the spirit in which we now face this question.

We sincerely want to know whether or not the Scriptures warrant the modern interpretation which answers our question in the affirmative. In our present study we shall endeavor to let the Bible speak for itself. Since late consideration of this question has involved arbitrary classification of men and theories and aroused some feeling we shall refrain from specific references to recent discussions.

Some of the fundamental considerations involved in a comprehensive study of this question emerge in a most arresting way in Christ's discussion with the Jewish authorities as reported in the eighth chapter of John's Gospel. The whole chapter is an acute analysis of the ultimate moral origin of unbelief, which is vitally involved in any fundamental discussion of Christ's relation to Israel according to the flesh. Paul very clearly states that the basic reason for Israel's failure was unbelief (Rom. 11). It is highly appropriate that we should begin here, for after all Christ is the full and final answer to our question. In the very nature of things our answer must be found in an intelligent understanding of Him and His mission.

In the controversy reported by John, Christ claimed that He was the light of the world, and that His light was the light of life and reality. The Jews challenged this claim, and Christ pointed out to them that they were mistaken in their judgment because they judged Him "after the flesh." They looked at things from a material point of view and therefore could not understand Christ. For the same reason they were ignorant of God. He reminded them that if they really knew God they would have no difficulty in knowing and understanding Him. This does not mean that they were irreligious. On the contrary they were intensely religious—the out-

standing religionists of their day. They professed to know the ultimate truth about God and were well versed in what men said about Him; but they did not know Him in a living experience. That is the starting point of religious materialism—a form of religion but no immediate creative experience of the ultimate source of all true religion. That attitude necessarily results in externalism, and its emphasis is always in the realm of the material. Hence when Christ told the Jews He was going away and that they could not follow Him they could only think of His words on the level of the material. “Will he kill himself?” Jesus showed them that at that very time they were living in fundamentally different worlds. While they were all Jews, of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh and consciously bound up in the same sense world, they were fundamentally different. So far as this real world and consciousness were concerned they were living in two different spheres of life.

They were from “beneath”; Jesus was from “above.” Their whole life outlook, consciousness, and aspiration were drawn from the “beneath” world, while Christ’s whole life was the result of an immediate experience of the “above” world. Christ knew and lived God. They did not know Him. That created two worlds, two spheres of life, one spiritual, the other materialistic. That was not mere theory or interpretation, but the statement of the most real thing in their experience. While in the same sense world, they were living two fundamentally different kinds of life. Christ looked at things and lived from the “above” and spiritual point of view. He was in unbroken fellowship with the Father and consciously doing the things that were pleasing to Him. His whole life was governed and dominated by

that consciousness. Indeed, that was His life. Their life was from the world point of view. They had the mind of men, and Christ reminded them that it was dominated and ruled by the evil one. He was following His Father's will, while they accepted the devil's philosophy of life. He was in the free world of the spirit; they were in bondage to sin. The one was inward and spiritual; the other was outward and materialistic.

When Christ suggested that they were in bondage they immediately protested that they were Abraham's children and therefore could not be in bondage to any man. Christ granted that they were Abraham's seed according to the flesh. On the other hand He definitely pointed out that they were not Abraham's real children because they neither lived his life nor did his works. They did not live in Abraham's world of faith, therefore could not live Abraham's life of faith nor fulfill the promise made to Abraham as the father of the faithful. Their life stood in sharp contrast to the life of Abraham who moved out from his material world and civilization in quest of a city that hath foundations whose maker and builder is God. In this quest he saw Christ's day and the realization of his dream in Him.

The Pharisees could not understand a vision and quest like that, for theirs was a different world, a world of sense and not of spirit. Christ was in Abraham's world and moving towards the fulfillment of his dream. In Dr. Westcott's fine words: "He and they belonged essentially to different regions: the spring of their life, the sphere of their thoughts were separated from the spring and sphere of His by an infinite chasm. The difference was equally great whether it was regarded in its final source or in its present manifestation. The circumstances of earthly life give scope for the em-

bodiment of two characters *absolutely opposed*. For earthly life lies between and in connection with two others. It may be swayed by higher or lower influences; it may be fashioned on a fleeting or an eternal type, and between these there can be no fellowship." This is the key to the conflict of the ages. God intended men for the higher sphere in which Abraham moved, the possibilities of which were finally revealed and made available in Christ. Men have been trying to realize life and the promises of God in the lower level, and their efforts have been marked by conflict, failure, and death. God has sought to win them to the higher sphere where His will and word are the law of life.

According to the Bible man was started in this sphere. He walked and worked with God in the Garden, and he sought God's will alone. Then came a suggestion from "beneath" regarding the perfecting of his life through material means. In response he forsook the divine word and government, government from "above," and chose the lower way, the earth level with its emphasis on externals. That was the beginning of materialism and the materialistic philosophy of life. From this point on the story of man is the story of deadly conflict between the higher and the lower, the spiritual and the materialistic conceptions of life, and men have succeeded or failed as they have chosen to follow the one or the other.

Abraham and Israel as a nation were called of God to be the exponents of the higher and spiritual way of life. When the Law was given through Moses it was given for the purpose of leading them to see the utter futility of life on the lower level and to lead them to Christ and through Him back into the higher sphere where they submit to the reign of God. The Law with

all its ritual could not save men from the lower life, but it could lead them to Christ, and that was its declared mission (Gal. 3:24). Its whole conception is theocratic—life governed from above. The material order is but a symbol and pattern of the spiritual order which is the world of reality. This conception is the warp and woof of the Mosaic order. To miss this is to lose our way in the interpretation of the Bible and the fulfillment of its promise. Israel's high calling was to make this spiritual interpretation and world real to the nations of the earth. The immediate government of God, government from above, was absolutely essential to the fulfillment of this mission. Its requirement was love to God and man, and its challenge was never fully met until Christ made it a reality in a life that was in perfect submission to the government of God.

Israel asked for a different kind of government, in order to be like the nations round about them. This was the beginning of the earthly monarchy in Israel, and it was not of God; He permitted it, but it was not His will for them. This conception was from "beneath" and was calculated to lead them back to the lower level of life which seeks its realization in externals. While this was permitted by God it was never accepted as replacing the divine ideal of life governed from above. This ideal could never be consummated in the sphere of the ideal chosen by Israel when they established the earthly monarchy. The divine ideal required a nation of priests and prophets who could adequately interpret God and spiritual realities to the world, which the monarchy of the earth level could never do.

David wanted to build a house for God on this level, but God showed him that he could not do this—God needed a different kind of house to fulfill the divine

ideal and the mission committed to Abraham, and He told David that He would build a house for him, one that would fulfill the eternal promise and order.

Both the Law and the monarchy were brought in because of men's failure to live the higher or spiritual life, and were only permitted or granted because God chose to use them to prepare the way for Christ and His living house—the order from above. The promise of a better day which kept the fires burning upon the altars of God always looked towards this order. This is the order that is represented by the city which Abraham sought, whose foundations are in the spiritual and not in the material realm. God showed Moses that the fulfillment of the promise was to be realized through a prophet like unto him, and the New Testament shows that this prophet is Christ. To David it was revealed that this fulfillment involved the building of a new house, the throne of which was to be occupied by the greater Son of David forever. The New Testament is quite clear on the fact that this new house is built in the resurrection order and that Jesus Christ is the greater Son of David, who is to reign over it, and that His Kingdom is from above and is not for a thousand years, but forever. Before He was born the angel told Mary that “the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end” (Luke 1:32-33).

A thousand years reign in Jerusalem could not in any sense fulfill that promise. Peter in referring to this fact says that David “being therefore a prophet and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins he would set one upon his throne; he foreseeing this spoke of the resurrection of

Christ." That is to say, the resurrection and the resurrection order are necessary to the fulfillment of the promise made to David. It is quite clear that it could never be fully realized in a merely Jewish kingdom in a purely earthly order after the likeness of the world powers. The promise as given to Abraham, Moses, and David required for its fulfillment a unique person and new house, or order. With this agree the messages of the prophets. However they added that it required not only a unique person, but a suffering servant. This part of the message the Jews never understood. It was an offense to them which they ignored in the prophecies and despised in its fulfillment in Christ. They could find no place for it in a militant earth level program such as they had in mind in the establishment of the monarchy.

When God revealed this order to one of earth's great kings it was likened to "a stone cut out without hands." It had no vital connection with the kingdoms that went before it; it was not of that order. It stood out in striking contrast to the image that represented the world powers that Israel wanted to be like when they chose to be a monarchy. It had no form or comeliness to attract on the earth level. But concerning it Daniel said that it should be set up in the days of the Roman Empire. It shall never be destroyed, nor its sovereignty be left to another people. It shall overcome and supersede all other kingdoms, and it shall stand forever. It was also revealed to him that a certain time was determined for his people, and then the unique One should come and the earthly order, with its material temple, earthly priests, and sacrifices, would be taken away, and the new order established. When we come to the New Testament we are confronted immediately with One who claimed to be

the fulfillment of the Old Testament promise. This is the key to the New Testament—Christ the realization of the Old Testament promise. It is the warp and woof of its crisis story. After Christ nothing can be the same. In Him God has done a fundamentally new thing, and a new challenge and responsibility have come to the human race—not only to the Jews, but to all men.

When Christ entered upon His public ministry consciously undertaking the fulfillment of the divine promise He was immediately confronted with the temptation to take up man's program of world conquest, a program of bread, spectacular exhibition, power, and spiritual compromise. He was asked to leave the realm of the will of God and His government and to realize His program on the earth level. He recognized this suggestion as from "beneath" and declared that man cannot live by bread alone nor realize his life by compromising his relation with God and the life from "above." Here we have emerging at the very threshold of His ministry the two kinds of life, life from "beneath" with its bread and materialistic program, and life from "above" realized in absolute obedience to the will of God. Christ made deliberate choice of the latter, but was constantly tempted to leave it for the lower level.

He announced that in fulfillment of the promise the Kingdom of God was at hand, and that He had come to suffer and die in order to make it real in the world. Yet He made it clear that His Kingdom was not of the world order; it was from "above"; there was nothing about it to attract men on the world level. The Jews understood perfectly that He claimed to be the promised Messiah, but they could not understand a Kingdom that was not of this world, nor a vital relationship with

Abraham that was not of the flesh. Hence the conflict between Christ and the Jewish authorities. They would have eagerly followed Him if He had offered them an earthly Kingdom with material signs and manifestations of power. To miss this is to miss the New Testament story.

He never offered the Jews an earthly Kingdom. He never intimated that He was ready to restore the earthly throne of David on the earthly level. I cannot find a single verse in the whole of the New Testament that even suggests this. Therefore there could be no postponement of such a Kingdom, and there could be no Kingdom of righteousness until He made it possible through His death and resurrection. Even His own disciples found it hard to understand a Messiah who was not ready to establish the throne of David on the earth level. They hoped that it was He who should redeem Israel, but they had no place for the cross and the resurrection and no adequate vision of the new order making possible a real reign of God in which the Old Testament promise could be fulfilled. They were disappointed and sorely perplexed when He declared that His Kingdom was not of this world.

All this is very definitely brought out in the post resurrection conversations of Jesus. Their main point was to show His disciples that He did not fail, but that He definitely carried out the divine program set forth in the prophecies leading to a new and higher order in which is realized the consummation of the divine purposes. He made it clear that the order of that program was suffering, resurrection, evangelization, and consummation. "These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and

the prophets, and the psalms concerning me. . . . Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations. . . ." (Luke 24:44, 46-47.) "All authority hath been given me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations . . . : teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you all the days, even unto the consummation of the age." (Matt. 28:18-20.)

At the last moment the disciples asked Jesus, "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" They evidently recognized that Jesus stated a literal fact when He said that the Kingdom of God would be taken from the Jews. But they forgot that He also told them that it was to be given to another nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. (Matt. 21:43.) After the Holy Spirit came upon them they came to understand this fact, that Israel according to the flesh failed because of unbelief, and that a new creation had taken place resulting in a new order which was a spiritual house and a holy nation which had its origin from "above" and was possessed of God. They came to understand fully that this was the true Israel, the real children of Abraham who were fulfilling the promise and represented the order of life which was governed from "above."

Peter recognized this holy nation as a spiritual house made up of living stones, with Christ, the stone which the builders rejected, the head of the corner. Jesus said that this was the very thing that was going to happen, when He told the Jewish leaders that the Kingdom of God was to be taken away from them. (Matt.

21:42-43; Acts 4:11; 1 Pet. 2:6-9.) The city of this order is the new Jerusalem, which, like the Kingdom of Christ, is from "above" and stands in contrast to the earthly Jerusalem, which was the city of Israel according to the flesh. Its people who fulfill the promise of the Old Testament are the children of faith who have been born into the new spiritual order. Paul says, "And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise" (Gal. 3:29).

What then about the earthly Israel, the Israel according to the flesh? Paul gives a very definite answer to the question. He says, "For they are not all Israel, that are of Israel: neither, because they are Abraham's seed, are they children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, *it is not the children of the flesh that are children of God*; but the children of the promise are reckoned for a seed." (Rom. 9:6-8.) Again on the same question he reminds us that "Abraham had two sons, one by the handmaid, and one by the freewoman. Howbeit the son by the handmaid is born after the flesh [that is, he was born in the flesh order with its suggestion from "beneath"; he was not suggested by God]; but the son by the freewoman is born through promise. Which things contain an allegory: for these women are two covenants; one from mount Sinai, bearing children unto bondage, which is Hagar. Now this Hagar is mount Sinai in Arabia and *answereth to the Jerusalem that now is* [the earth order]: for she is in bondage with her children. But *the Jerusalem that is above* [the spiritual order] is free, *which is our mother*." (Gal. 4:22-26.)

There is a conflict between these two orders. "He that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, *so also it is now*." What is to be

the issue? Both these orders cannot endure. Therefore "Cast out the handmaid and her son [the earth order and its issue]: for the son of the handmaid shall not inherit with the son of the freewoman" (Gal. 4:30). Is it likely that God is going back to the Hagar order, that is, the Israel after the flesh order, after the covenant of the freewoman has been established? Paul says, "For freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage." That is to say, having come to know God in a living experience in the realm of the spirit, do not turn back again to the weak and beggarly rudiments of the flesh life and order. "We through the Spirit by faith wait for the hope of righteousness," for "Faith worketh by love." This is the principle of the spirit order which alone makes possible the realization of the promise.

This is again made clear by the Epistle to the Hebrews—God in the past spoke to the fathers in the prophets bit by bit and in divers manners. At the end of these days He has spoken unto us in a Son who is *heir of all things*, the fulfillment of all things. This Son is greater than the angels; He is more than Moses, who was only a servant in the house, whereas He is the Son who abides in His house. He also supersedes the Hebrew priesthood with its tabernacle, altars, and sacrifices. They could not open a way into the presence of God, for they could not effectively deal with sin. What they could not do the Son was able to do; He opened a new and a living way into the presence of God and is able to save to the uttermost all who come unto Him. Therefore there is a *disannulling* of the foregoing order because of its weakness and unprofitableness and a bringing in through the Son of a better hope by which we draw nigh unto God. He is the mediator of a better

covenant, and *taketh away* the first that He may establish the second, or spirit, covenant.

The sin question having been settled there is *no more* a sacrificial order, which at most only pointed to Christ, the sacrifice. The new born ones draw near to God with a true heart in *fulness of faith*. They now belong to the family of faith whose captain and perfecter is Jesus. As such they are not come to the old order with its darkness, conflict, and tempest. They "*are come*" unto Mount Zion—not Hagar's mount, but Sarah's mount. Therefore they are come, not unto Hagar's city, the earthly Jerusalem, but unto the city of the living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem, the city which hath foundations and whose builder and maker is God. This is the city of the new covenant, which is made real through the new mediator, Jesus Christ. This order is a Kingdom that cannot be shaken, the abiding order represented by the stone of Daniel's prophecy. This suggests the *removing* of the things that have been made, that the things which are not shaken may remain. God is not going back to the mere shadows and shaking things again—why should He? The Hagar order, which is the earthly Jewish order, must give way to the spiritual order of faith which is from above. That which is spiritual is not first, but that which is psychical, the earth order, then that which is spiritual, represented by the last Adam, who is Christ and is from above.

The consummation of the promise is in this realm and involves "the coming down out of heaven from God" of the Jerusalem which represents it. This is the picture that is given us of the realization of the quest for the city that abides. Abraham sought a city which hath foundations whose maker and builder is God. That was the quest of faith, but he did not realize the

promise in his day; yet he had the assurance of its reality in the vision of Christ and His day in which we with Abraham and all the men of faith shall be made perfect. (Heb. 11:39-40.) This is all involved in the picture of the new Jerusalem coming down from Heaven. It has foundations whose builder and maker is God and gates which He has built therein. On the gates are the names of the twelve tribes of Israel and on the foundations the names of the twelve apostles. The men of faith of all the ages are built into it. It is the living house of royal priesthood, the holy nation absolutely possessed of God and fulfilling all the promises of the past in their fullest and final meanings. That represents the final triumph of the spiritual order. There is no place here for the revival of a Jewish earth order which is clearly shown to be a parenthesis, which perfected nothing, but led up to Christ who is the file leader and perfecter of the order of faith which in the very nature of things must be a spiritual order. This does not mean that the fulfillment is hazy and indefinite because it is spiritual. To say that is the essence of materialism. Lord Tennyson writing to Mrs. Bradley said, "There are moments when I feel and know the flesh to be vision, God and the spiritual the only real and true." That is the New Testament point of view, and is the only philosophy of life and our world which could make possible the fulfillment of the great and cosmic promises of the Word of God. No mechanical and purely biological ideas, such as are involved in the theory that physical descent from Abraham makes possible spiritual privileges, can possibly realize the New Testament freedom represented by the sons of God. That ideal must be perfected in the spiritual order, of which Christ is the head.

What then shall we say of such passages as Romans 9-11? In the light of what we have found to be the main thought of the Word of God we need to read them over again with earnest care. If we do so I think we will find that, as a matter of fact, they make no provision for a world program that involves the rebuilding of Jerusalem in the earth order and the establishment of the old Jewish ritual and its world order monarchy. The Epistle to the Romans was written for the purpose of showing that the Jewish order with its Law failed to bring in true righteousness and that both Jews and Gentiles were under condemnation. But what the Law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh Christ actually accomplished, "God, sending his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the requirement of the law [the ideal of the Law] might be fulfilled in us, who walk *not after the flesh, but after the spirit*" (Rom. 8:3-4). This is the realm in which the requirement of the Law is to be realized, and it is not material, but spiritual.

This does not mean that the Word of God concerning Israel has come to naught. To begin with, they are not *all Israel* that are of Israel. The fact that they are Abraham's seed does not make them children. It is not the children of the flesh that are children of God, but the children of the promise. The children of the promise are the children of faith. The children of the flesh failed because they lacked faith and were cast out—the Kingdom of God was taken away from them. They stumbled at the stone order which is from "above." Therefore they could not continue as the priestly order of God. Does this mean that God has absolutely cast off His people? 'No,' said Paul, 'that cannot be, for I am an Israelite of the seed of Abraham according to

the flesh, and I am saved. I have obtained that which Israel seeketh—the fulfillment of the promises. I belong to the election who are the children of faith. They are the real Israel. So all Israel shall be saved, even as it is written, there shall come out of Zion [that is the Isaac, or spiritual, order] the deliverer. He shall turn away unrighteousness from Jacob; and this is the covenant unto them, when God shall take away their sins.'

Hebrews 10 tells us when Christ sealed this new covenant unto them and took away sin. If Israel is to be saved they must come into this new covenant order, for they cannot be saved in the old order. That is the whole point of the letter to the Romans. That is exactly what Paul says in chapter 11. If they are going to be saved, they must be grafted in by faith just exactly where believers in Christ now are. He also makes it clear that if the Gentiles are to realize the fulfillment of the promise they must through faith stay in that realm. There is absolutely no provision made here for a different order and way of salvation for the Jews and no provision for a Hagar program which is according to the flesh. This sphere in which believers in Christ are living is the sphere of the new race of which Christ is the head, and He is not going back to the old Adamic order to perfect what is begun in the spirit order.

I have most carefully gone over all the passages which are used in support of the earthly Jewish program involved in an affirmative answer to the question under consideration, and I cannot find how they can be reasonably used to support such an answer. I will give two or three illustrations. The book of Daniel shows that four great world powers were to prevail in succession, and in the days of the last of the four a unique order

was to appear, not in line with the preceding orders, but from "above," and it was represented as the final, abiding, and eternal order. Daniel was concerned about his own earthly people and made inquiry of God regarding them. He was told that *seventy weeks*, a definite period of time, was decreed upon them and upon their city, and then the Anointed One was to appear, and He was to settle the question of sin, make an end of the Jewish ritual, and "*bring in* everlasting righteousness."

The affirmative answer to our question requires that we say that the stone order was not to appear during the Roman Empire, but at the end of the present age—that the seventy weeks decreed upon the Jewish people meant not really seventy weeks, but sixty-nine weeks plus nineteen hundred and more years, and then one more week. If the last week has reference to the end of this age, then the time determined was seventy weeks plus all the time between Christ's first coming and His second coming, because the Jews have been living all this time, and the affirmative answer program requires that it was decreed that they should live. It is very much simpler to take the narrative as it reads and recognize that the unique person did actually come in the days of the Roman Empire, that He actually settled the question of sin and introduced a unique order making possible everlasting righteousness, that the Jewish earthly order with its temple and sacrifices was finished, and that the destiny of that people from that time on was determined by the attitude they were to take to the new order introduced by the Anointed One.

Take another passage, Peter's speech on the day of Pentecost, which was an explanation of what happened to the disciples on that day. He most definitely says that *this* thing that has happened is *that* thing which

hath been spoken through the prophet Joel, and that the exalted Christ poured out *this* which is now a reality in the life of believers. This is the beginning of it. It is here in reality, but it is not yet consummated. That is very simple and is very much more reasonable than to think that Peter quoted that passage and meant to say that this is that which Joel said, but that it is not going to be realized until the end of this age. No, that is too obviously an accommodation interpretation. Peter said this thing that you now see and that you are calling drunkenness is not drunkenness at all; it is actually the new spirit order of which Joel spoke.

Just one more passage. James, as recorded in Acts 15, after hearing what Peter and others had said about what God was actually doing among the Gentiles said: "Brethren, harken unto me: Symeon hath rehearsed how first God visited the Gentiles, to take of them a people for his name." Peter told them about what God was *then* doing. James continues: "To this agree the words of the prophets: as it is written, After these things I will return, and I will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen . . . that the residue of men may seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called." Peter told them about Gentiles being saved and baptized with the Holy Spirit, and James said, 'Yes, here it is in the Scripture, and this is the way it is done. God takes up the work of building the house of David that He promised to build for him, and in doing so the salvation of the Gentiles is made possible.' If that is not the meaning I cannot see what bearing the passage has upon the question that was under consideration. Yet it is one of the key passages used to teach that God is now calling out a people from among the Gentiles who are the church, which is a parenthesis, and that after He gets through He will go

back again and establish the earthly monarchy of David, and that will be another special blessing to the Gentiles.

No, God is building; He is fulfilling His promise to David and to Abraham, but He is fulfilling it in the new resurrection and spiritual order which is to be consummated in the city which hath foundations built and made by Him—He is the one who is doing the building. When Christ is revealed apart from sin at His second coming, which is to be according to His own promise, personal and visible, the new Jerusalem will also be unveiled, and we shall see it in its spiritual glory—in His glory, “for the glory of God did lighten it, and the lamp thereof is the Lamb.” It is to this city that the nations and the kings of the earth shall bring their glory.

The Pharisees’ program was provincial and material. This program, which is Christ’s program, is spiritual and cosmic. It belongs to the abiding order, and no mere earthly or Jewish program could meet its implications and requirements. God is seeking believing souls and a collective organization in which He can dwell and which can adequately interpret His life and purpose. Christ is building such an organization, the holy city, the Jerusalem from above, which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God, and in which Abraham and all the children of faith shall realize their dream and the quest of the ages, for the throne of God and the Lamb shall be therein—perfect government from “above,” and they shall serve Him, for they shall see His face, and in its light they shall reign for ever and ever.

In coming to this conclusion we have not set aside the Word of God, as we believe it with deep conviction. If our interpretations of it are wrong, the Word still stands, and we accept it as the enduring will of God which shall prevail when our little systems have had their day and have ceased to be.

VISITATION EVANGELISM IN THE COUNTRY CHURCH

By HENRY W. McLAUGHLIN, D.D., Director of the Country Church Department of the Presbyterian Church in the United States

THERE was a time when the impenitent came to church. Today few of the great mass of unevangelized in the large cities ever come under the sound of a preacher's voice. This is also becoming true in the rural districts. There was a time when the unconverted would flock in great numbers to an extensively advertised meeting conducted by some famous evangelist, but they will not do it now. The audiences of these meetings are made up almost entirely of church members. The unregenerate would rather go to the theater, the baseball park or some other place of amusement.

Preaching will not evangelize the sinners unless they are present to hear it. The exigencies of the times demand that methods different from those successful at other periods must be put into operation. There was a time when people would read tracts but they will not do it to any great extent now. There is too much else to read that is more interesting to the impenitent. There never was a time when the Gospel had more counter attractions. What is to be done?

We may be able to learn something from business. Men in the business world have changed their methods to meet changed conditions. How do wholesale merchants sell their goods? Not like their fathers did. Do they wait for customers to come? Any wholesale merchant who would adhere to that policy today would go into bankruptcy. Men are sent in person to the trade,

and it is secured. How do life insurance companies secure such a vast business? They send trained men who by personal appeal convince the prospective buyer that it is to his advantage to insure his life. Insurance men of long experience say that they have never had a single individual, of his own accord, apply for life insurance.

There is no other method of exerting influence that gets more satisfactory results than through personality. There is no other way to reach the unevangelized in this new day, unless we can get the individuals of our congregations, in both city and country, to do visitation evangelism. So long as our people refuse to do this the great masses of men, women, and children will remain without the pale of the church. If sinners are to be brought to Christ they must be reached as individuals by individuals. As servants of the Master Christians must "go out into the highways and hedges and compel them to come in—" compel them by the tactful, earnest, and sympathetic Christlike touch. The Gospel of Jesus Christ is still "the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth." It is a changeless Gospel, but the conditions are changing. If we are to bring men to Christ, under the blessing of God, in this new day we must use those methods best suited to our age. This has been called the new evangelism, but it is the old evangelism. It was Christ's method. It was the method of His disciples. Andrew brought Peter. John brought James. Philip brought Nathanael. One by one the church grew.

It is pleasing to a preacher to feel that he is the sole agent in bringing people into the church, but that is not the best way. Members brought into the church by the pastor alone do not become so cemented into the church as they do when brought in by the members. Too many

join the preacher rather than the church. If a preacher is to widen his influence and make it permanent he must act through his church members. He should act as the head of his congregation, not in its stead. "He is to preach to the church from the Gospel so that the church may preach the Gospel to the world." Every properly constituted church is an evangelizing agency. It is a life-saving station and its members a life-saving crew. "It is God's ordained missionary society, and every member a life member."

Every pastor should be an evangelist—but through his church rather than apart from it. If Christ had trusted to immediate contact with the world, Christianity would have been a failure. It was not enough for Him to influence men; He must influence the world through men. This was necessary that His influence might become permanent and worldwide. He gathered about Him a few men, taught, trained, and sent them forth to tell other men. Every body of disciples became an evangelizing agency. "They went everywhere preaching the gospel." If Christ and Paul did not try to operate alone, no ordinary preacher should attempt it. Many ministers fail, not because they are not good operators, but because they are poor co-operators. It is far better for the sinner to be brought to Christ through the efforts of one of the members than for the pastor to be the sole agent. In the sphere of the Kingdom a work done through another secures a triple blessing. A pastor who inspires one of his members to bring a sinner to the Saviour, secures a blessing for himself, one for the saved sinner, and one for the member. It may have been this Christian's first achievement; it will not be his last. A new evangelizing force has been started in the world.

What our churches need is unity of life. This can be realized only when the pastor has his members associated with him in the business of evangelism. A bond of unity develops in the fellowship of service. The church thus becomes an organism, rather than a mechanism, constructed by the pastor. It will continue its life development whether it has a preacher or not. There is nothing that is a better stimulus to consistency, nothing more conducive to Christian growth, than the consciousness of the fact that they as members of the church are partners in the business of soul-saving. A feeling of responsibility for others is both rein and spur.

On Mother's Day, 1929, a visit was made to a country church in the Valley of Virginia, where sixteen years had been spent by the writer in a very happy pastorate. It is a farmers' church located in the open country with oak and maple trees about it, and nearby runs a clear, trickling, mountain stream. The membership consists almost entirely of large landowners, small landowners, and tenants. On the day of the visit there were 127 present in the older men's Bible class, which had grown from a humble beginning. In the afternoon about 800 people gathered under the shade of the trees on the lawn, and I spoke to them from the front steps of the church. I was a city pastor before I was promoted to this congregation. I made a study of personal evangelism just before the call was accepted. During this pastorate I tried, in an imperfect way, to practice in person and through the members visitation evangelism in this country parish. There were received annually an average of twenty-nine persons on profession of faith. If the work had been more faithfully performed the results would have been greater. Notwithstanding the large loss by death and removal to city churches dur-

ing these sixteen years the church doubled its membership, growing from 335 to 670. During this period I learned as much by my failures as by my successes.

ORGANIZING THE WORK

If I were to become the pastor of a country church again, I would rely even more upon visitation evangelism. Permit me to give here my own ideas of what should be done, based upon practical experience with ways unsuccessful and successful. Having decided upon the parish boundary, I would make a complete survey, securing the co-operation of the people. I would have a house to house canvass made, calling it an Every Member Friendly Visitation.

For this canvass there would be made the following preparations: I would call together a number of faithful, consistent men and women and explain the whole scheme to them. Then I would select a director whose business it would be to organize the campaign and to whom reports should be made. The visitors should be chosen. Each should have a copy of *Fishers of Men* and study it. This is an edition of the New Testament edited by Wade C. Smith.¹ I would insist upon each visitor reading at least two books on some form of personal work. I would suggest *Visitation Evangelism*, by Kernahan; *Adventures in Visitation Evangelism*, Kernahan; *Come and See*, Wade C. Smith; *Every Member Evangelism*, Conant. After these books had been read and personal instruction given, I would take the following steps:

1. The community should be districted.
2. Canvassers appointed and assigned.

¹ Published by the Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Virginia.

3. Prayer made for God's guidance with each group.

4. Instructions given to talk with the people about community betterment, especially through the church.

5. Instructions to foster community spirit and church loyalty.

6. Instructions to read some appropriate passage of Scripture and offer prayer in each family.

7. Instructions on how to fill blanks and secure information with as little ostentation as possible.

8. Instructions to secure pledges for future conduct and make the answer (yes), (with a circle around it).

9. Instructions to return promptly the reports to the director of the canvass.

10. The canvassers should be sent out, Scripturally, two and two.

This canvass may be made in one day. It is important that results be tabulated and a systematic follow-up work be carried on. A map of each district, and also of the whole community, should be made, locating each home. If so desired, the denominational complexity of each home may be indicated on this map by colored headed pins. I have used a manila envelope with instructions for making the canvass on the front and a blank for making the reports on the back. In this envelope there is a pad with fifteen sheets with blanks providing for information to make a card index for each family, and a card for each member of the family. This outfit is sufficient for each pair of visitors, providing their district does not contain more than fifteen families.

Appropriate places are provided on the blanks for name and address of head of family, names of members, ages, information showing whether they owned or

rented their place, public school attendance, church membership, church preferred, distance from church, regularity of attendance, membership in Sunday School, membership in young people's society, those who had been baptized, whether family worship is conducted, what church paper is taken, whether family has an automobile and if they will use it to bring themselves and others to church. There would also be the usual space for remarks.

This plan prevents overlapping and guarantees that no family and no individual are overlooked. It offers an opportunity to approach each individual in a natural way.

Suppose we are two visitors who have been properly prepared and to whom fifteen families having been assigned. Our prime object is to lead each person in our district to Christ. We should approach our task as did Frances Ridley Havergal when she was invited to spend a fortnight in a family where there were ten persons, most of them not members of the church and the others not rejoicing Christians. She said that she prayed that God would give her everyone of them, and before she had left the home God had answered her prayer. She said that the last night in the home she was so happy she could not sleep, and there came to her the poem which has been sung around the world, "Take my life and let it be consecrated, Lord, to Thee."

There will be found some persons who are members of the church, but not rejoicing Christians. These may be members who are not church-going. It is advisable to get as much information before reaching the home as possible. We should get the information as applied to the whole family; but it is the individual that is of vital importance.

We should deal first with the father. We should find out in the most tactful way possible whether or not he is a member of the church. If he is not we should visit with him about his soul, using mainly Scripture quotations. We should try to follow as nearly as possible the example of Jesus as He talked with the woman at the well. He talked first about something in which she was interested. He formed a point of contact, He led her to talk of herself and her beliefs and then tactfully led her to drink of the Water of Life. She was led not only to accept salvation, but to become a witness-bearer of the truth. There is no finer manual for the personal worker than is found in the first, third, and fourth chapters of the Gospel of John.

We should next find out whether this man is a regular attendant at church or not. There are many members of the church, especially in the country districts, who do not attend church and seem to have but little idea of what it means to be a Christian. I would say to such a person: 'We need your presence at church for the sake of your example to others, for the sake of your children and your neighbors.' We should try to show him that the church is God's divinely ordained missionary society and every member a life member, and that no man is a true member of the church who does not try to bring others to know Jesus Christ. We should try to show him that the church is God's divinely instituted society for answering the prayer of Christendom, "Thy kingdom come"; and that every man who honestly wants to see the rule of Christ in the hearts of men should ally himself with the church, not only by membership, but by attendance and by actual participation in its worship and all of its activities. We should show him that if he is going to help the church in its

divinely appointed task his presence is necessary. We should say to him: 'We are starting things anew, and we need your presence. Will you not promise that you will come regularly?' If he says he will we should write 'Yes,' with a circle around it, showing that he had made the promise.

Next we should ask whether he attended Sunday School. He may say that when he joined the church he attended Sunday School for a while but got careless about his Christian living, stopped attending church, and dropped out of Sunday School. We should tell him that we wanted to start a men's Bible class, and wanted him to come and bring his neighbors. We would remind him that he had some influence and, with his help, we can have a real Sunday School. If he promised, we would put another 'Yes,' with a circle around it.

Our next question should be: 'Have you family worship in your home?' He may answer something like this: 'No, I am sorry to tell you we do not. When I joined the church the minister told me I should have a family altar in my home. We did establish it and kept it up for a while. My life is not what it ought to be. That boy of mine knows me pretty well. For years we have had no reading of the Scriptures or prayer in our home.' We would make some such reply as this: 'You might talk it over with your boy and tell him that we are beginning things anew in this neighborhood and ask his co-operation, as well as that of the other members of the family, in maintaining the family altar where a passage of Scripture will be read and prayer offered. It is easier to maintain a family altar in a country home than in the city, as the family is more of a unit, the pursuits of the various members of the family are much the

same, and things are not so hurried.' If he agreed to establish family worship we would record it as before.

We should next take up with him the matter of a religious paper in the home and talk to him about the importance of having the right kind of reading for the children, if possible getting his subscription at once, or his promise to subscribe.

If my fellow visitor and I have succeeded so well with a man like this we have done a good day's work. We may get refusals right straight through. But if we fail with the head of the household, there is the wife. I know some homes in which the husbands are not Christians, but where the mothers have been brought to know Christ and have assumed the responsibility of Christian leadership in the family. We may fail with the mother; but there are the children, each one of them. If we reach the children and enlist their participation in an active, religious program, there are strong probabilities that the parents will be reached. In more than one home I know of parents having been brought to Christ through the influence of their children.

One of the very essential things in this Every Family Friendly Visitation is the follow-up work. One pair of canvassers may have in some cases failed; but they have been able to get the information, and the work should be followed up by persons who have special gifts and can make points of contact and reach the individuals.

As pastor, I would preach to the whole congregation a series of sermons on evangelism. Subjects like this may be selected: Every Member of the Church a Soul-winner; The Joys of Personal Work; The Method of Jesus in Building His Church, etc. No minister can expect to have a soul-winning church who is not him-

self a soul-winning minister. His sermons need not all be termed evangelistic, but all should have an evangelistic note, calculated to inform and inspire his people in the ways of evangelism.

AGENCIES

If I were again becoming the pastor of a country church I would endeavor to enlist all the agencies of my congregation in personal evangelism.

First: I would lay more emphasis upon the responsibility of the parents in leading their children to Christ and training them in His service. There are so many good agencies at work that parents sometimes come to feel that they can shift the responsibility that God placed upon them when He gave the children into their arms. As far as possible all the parents should be brought to promise to bring their children up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, to pray with and for them, to set before them a Godly example, and to teach them both the way of salvation and the principles of Christian living. They should be inspired with faith and expectancy that God will save their children and that they will come into the church openly acknowledging their Saviour. We need to get back to religious education in the home. In every community there are parents who are not members of the church, and some who are members will not assume their religious obligations as parents. Sunday Schools are thus necessary.

Second: I would enlist the Sunday School teachers and officers. Some of the happiest persons I have ever known have been Sunday School teachers who had been used in bringing their entire classes to the Saviour. I would keep constantly before my teachers, as I dealt with them in the teachers' meetings, the duty and the joy of winning their pupils to Christ and training them

in His service. There is something wrong with any Sunday School where the boys and girls grow to manhood and womanhood and have not been brought to Christ. There is something wrong also with the Sunday School that loses its boys and girls as they approach maturity.

It was my privilege as a college boy to know personally Dwight L. Moody. Once, in company with other college students, I called upon him in his home at Northfield. He took us into the yard, threw himself down on the grass, and talked to us. Although it has been published many times I am writing down here, as I remember it from his own lips, the story of how he came to give up business and devote his entire time to evangelism. He said he was a boot and shoe merchant in Chicago and was superintendent of a Sunday School of more than a thousand members. He was very proud of it, and once he had the President of the United States address it. There was a class of girls in their early 'teens, one of the most trying classes he had. Once, when the teacher was absent, he undertook to teach them and was tempted to turn them into the street.

One day the teacher came into his store and broke down. "My doctor," said he, "has told me that I must go home to die." "You are not afraid to die," said Moody. "No, but I am thinking of that class of girls. I have been teaching them for some time, and not one of them is a Christian." Moody was a man of action, and said at once: "Suppose we visit them." He hired a carriage, and they visited every one, though they could go to see only two or three of them a day as the teacher's strength was failing; but when they had visited them all, each one had given her heart to Christ. On the morning the teacher left, without any pre-arrangement, they all

came to the station to say goodbye. Moody said he went back to his store, but had no taste for selling shoes. He wanted to talk to every man who came into his store about his soul. He gave up the business to devote his entire life to evangelism.

Every Sunday School teacher should be taught to realize the magnitude of his opportunities, and the corresponding responsibilities.

Third: I would try to make a soul-winner out of each one of my officers. I would district my congregation and assign an officer to each district, with a definite pastoral responsibility. I would visit with these officers and try to show them how to win their people to Christ and to train them in the principles of Christian living. I would alternate as I went into the homes with the officers. In one home I would read the Scripture and have the officer lead in prayer; and in the next home I would have the officer read, while I led in prayer. I would continue in visitation with my officers until I got them trained, and then these officers would be sent out, two and two, or the officers might take younger men with them in order to train them.

Fourth: I would train the young people of my congregation in the art of soul-winning. Young people are sometimes more successful than older people, especially in winning young women and young men of their own age. I know a country congregation where the young people made a house to house friendly visitation and talked to the young people who were not Christians. Then they invited them all to a young peoples' meeting on Sunday night, where an invitation was given for public confession; and thirteen young people came forward and united with the church. It is often easier to get the young people to do personal work than those

of maturer years. With their love of adventure they can be enlisted in personal service for Christ, if they are presented with a challenge and trained in the performance of the task.

Fifth: The great unused power of the church is the man power. Every country church should organize its men and give them definite assignments of work in social service, in religious education, in an aggressive church program of worship, and in personal evangelism. One reason that men do so little is because we have come to expect so little of them. The church should be a training school for Christian service. Campaigns of visitation evangelism have been successful in city churches, where the men of the church have been enlisted. My personal opinion, based on experience, is, that, if the same effort and efficiency were used to enlist the men in the country communities, visitation evangelism could be made very successful in the rural areas.

Sixth: The women of the church constitute the most willing of all the groups. They have been left until last because there is a tendency to place all the responsibility on them in many of our country congregations. When one has failed with all the other groups he can count on the women. However, it is a mistake to place too much responsibility on the good women of the church, and allow the man power to atrophy because it has failed to function.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

We should not confuse evangelism with revival meetings. I believe in revival meetings, but it is a mistake for any country congregation to depend upon them as their sole program of evangelism. The schedule of

too many churches is a revival meeting and a backsliding. An old woman in giving her experience, said: "I have been a member of the church for nigh on to forty years, off and on." One of the prime requisites for the building of the Kingdom of God among the country people is the three hundred sixty-five day program of evangelism on the part of the country church. It requires a higher type of Christian living to be able to carry on continuous activity in soul-winning than to be able to do personal work during the period of an emotional meeting.

The greatest difficulty is that there are but few country communities in which there is a country church that really functions. There are many little buildings, many little organizations, but the country multitudes are as sheep scattered abroad, having no shepherd. Most of these little country churches have only an occasional preaching service by an absentee minister. There is no permanent, adequate program of teaching or of evangelism.

Where the country community does not have a resident minister, or a church organization capable of putting on an adequate program of religious education and visitation evangelism, it becomes the duty of the churches in the nearest town to go out to the country people, either by organizing and sending bands of Christian men and women, or better still by supporting trained Christian workers to live among the country people and train local leaders for the task.

The town is the capital of the countryside. It is the trade center; sometimes it is the school center. The town is dependent upon the country. If the countryside should cease to trade with the town and send its people to populate it, the town could not survive. The town

has an obligation to provide for the country people the right kind of religious privileges.

I know a town church that has done just this thing. Twenty years ago there was in the county one church of this denomination. The men of the church were organized and sent out to do visitation evangelism and organize Sunday Schools and to provide for paid, trained workers. Twenty years ago there was one manse, now four manses; one preacher, now five preachers; one church, now nine churches; then 400 members, now 1900 members; then \$50,000 worth of property, now \$500,000 worth of property. The town church should, by this method of visitation evangelism and Sunday School work, strive to make every dweller in the countryside a Christian. It is not only the command of the Master, but the real growth and spiritually of the town church depends upon such a course of action.

There are hundreds of thousands of country homes throughout the nation that have never been visited by a minister or other Christian worker. The spiritual destitution in many of our rural areas, especially where white tenancy is prevalent, is appalling. The cities of the nation, where crime is so prevalent, have large numbers who were originally country people, who were born and reared in communities where the people have been underprivileged in sanitation, social advantages, economic privileges, educational facilities, and religious opportunities. There are many things in our national life that are calculated to give us grave concern.

What hope is there of a better day? The future of America is threatened unless it can be made Christian, not only in name, but in fact. America can never be made Christian by Christianizing only its towns and cities. It must be made Christian in the source of its

supply. We do not expect fruitful orchards without nurseries, abundant harvests without seed plots, nor great rivers without springs. Dr. George W. Truett recently said: "We are at the dawn of the world's greatest tomorrow." That can be made possible only if America becomes Christian. I do not know any way to make it Christian, other than by a widespread, continuous visitation evangelism in city, town, and countryside.

THE REVIEW

CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

THE BRIEF QUOTATIONS IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING, AND GIVEN without comment, have been taken just as they came to notice in the general press. Yet, while they have not been selected with any theme in mind, a large proportion of them strike a deep spiritual note. This is true of a great deal of current matter, even in the secular press.

"The man who is too busy to serve God is—too busy."—*Breakfast Club of Los Angeles*.

"Improvement by constant betterment is superior to improvement by catastrophe."—*Charles F. Thwing*.

"A great many people must be getting tired of having so many things and want to move out and live in trees."—*Harper's Magazine*.

"God has called others to expose modern unbelief in church and school but he called me to defend the truth by preaching it in love."—*The late Dr. F. B. Meyer*.

"So preach that your people will recognize that Christianity is more than a truth to be understood; it is a tranquillity to be achieved."—*Rev. Fred Smith*.

"There are those, also, whom I have known who could never become the ministers of big churches, yet made themselves ministers of great churches."—*The Churchman*.

"Although doubts again and again drive men away from the Cross their needs draw them back to it once more."—*Rev. Principal Alfred E. Garvie, D.D., in The British Weekly*.

"Humility is a beautiful virtue but to be timid, fearful and therefore unwilling to attempt great things for God is not humility but lack of trust in God."—*The Watchman-Examiner*.

"The true ideal of Christian evangelism is the propagation

of Christianity, not by public preachers so much as by private conversation and the testimony of common men."—*Robert E. Speer in The Christian Advocate.*

"The greatest regeneration of social relationships results from the transformation of the lives of a few individuals. It is the men who do most with their solitariness who have most to give to society."—*Harold E. B. Speight.*

"We are living in an age of go-getters, however much we may deplore the type, and we are so infected with the spirit of the age that we are not happy if we are different."—*A writer in The Contributors' Club in The Atlantic Monthly.*

"There are two type of professors now teaching in our colleges and universities. The one derives his chief inspiration from learning, the other from life; the one goes in for research, the other for teaching."—*Hamilton Holt in The Forum.*

"Why is it, we wonder, that scholars feel that a book which is popular cannot be scholarly, or perhaps it would be more accurate to inquire why they feel that a scholarly, or sound, book cannot be popular?"—*Princeton University Press Almanac.*

"While in the conflict between capital and labor, the sympathies of the preacher are with the under dog; yet there is something more important to his mind than even helping the under dog. His chief concern is to get the dog nature out of both dogs."—*John Andrew Holmes.*

"The church formerly exercised a restraining influence upon the lawless tendencies of certain elements in communities. Perhaps it still does to some extent, but no one can fail to realize that its authority has been greatly weakened, if not destroyed."—*George W. Wickersham.*

"I wonder if we ought not to get closer to people in the church than we are getting in the formal Sunday service and in the worship period as we know it. Do these furnish the proper medicine for the cure of souls who have not found themselves?"—*R. W. G. in The Congregationalist.*

"Once when I was walking with Henry Drummond on the streets of Edinburgh, I put this question to him, 'What three courses of Bible study would you recommend?' After thinking awhile, he replied: 'I would recommend that they study first,

the life of Jesus Christ; secondly, the life of Jesus Christ; and thirdly, the life of Jesus Christ.'"—*Dr. John R. Mott.*

"The 'old-time religion' enabled followers and worshipers to have religious experience. The 'practical' teaches that we must think of the group, enlarge it, advertise it, boost it. Doing this publicity work takes so much of our time and thought that we do not have time for meditation, hence do not give God a chance to allow us an experience."—*Calvin T. Ryan in Zion's Herald.*

"We men and women are reasoning beings, to be sure, but despite training and exhortation, we remain in the aggregate, and probably will for all time remain, primarily feeling beings. It is our hearts, not our heads, that dictate most of our preferences, and it is in the light of emotion not of logic that we yield our allegiances and proclaim our enthusiasms."—*The Saturday Review of Literature.*

DO GOOD PEOPLE NEED CONVERSION? IS THE TITLE OF A searching paper by Rev. J. Ernest Rattenbury in *The Methodist Recorder*. The very question ought to be enough to start most thorough self-examination among our church members, and among our ministers too. There is a lot of goodness lying about like neglected coal piles; it is real goodness, so far as it goes; it is clean and has great potentialities—heat, light, power. Yet something is lacking to release all these possibilities.

Multitudes of professing Christians live clean, fine lives and have in themselves gifts that might warm other hearts, illuminate other lives, and move mountains; yet they do nothing—except remain good. As in coal, so in human life; there must be a transforming agent and the experience of a great change, or the things that might be will remain locked up, inert, unrealized, and the soul will at the last day stand beside the man with the one talent. But what is going to change all this and make the church a spiritual and moral power house? Do good people need conversion? Mr. Rattenbury has especially in mind people of his own denomination; but since the matter is of general concern, let us have his own answer to his question:

"Conversion is not merely for burglars but for the educated children of Methodism. It is not as the Roman Catholics would describe it—merely a turning of the soul to God—but it is the work of God in the soul. The fact that God comes into a human life and reshapes it, and gives peace of soul and power of conduct and service is the outstanding testimony of the Methodist Church and its verification in experience is the most important of all things for the new Methodism. And that this experience is not merely the vivid emotional effect of two sharply contrasted careers in one life, like that of the burglar who becomes a Christian, but a privilege to which all men are called, is written deeply on Methodist history.

"What was the conversion of John and Charles Wesley? It was not the conversion of two burglars to Christianity. It was not the conversion of two bad men. It was not the conversion of two vulgar and uneducated persons. It was not the conversion of two men ignorant of the Scripture or of religious habit and practice. It was the conversion of two very godly, educated and religious persons, of whom it might be asked, did they need conversion at all?

"A question asked me months ago has been ringing in my mind ever since. 'Are we teaching our young people the need of a religious life deeper than that of the Wesleys *before* their conversion?' That question, to my mind, puts trenchantly the most important challenge to the Methodists of our day. Are we?

"I believe in training children for God, and putting on them the onus of turning their backs on their Heavenly Father. But did not Susannah Wesley believe the same? I see no reason why children should not grow up trusting God and continuing in the belief they enjoyed as infants. They had assurance then. Such certainly are of the Kingdom of God. But does this experience continue among all our young people? I find little evidence of it. Are we putting before them, when it does not, the evangelical faith which changed the Wesleys and made Methodism? It may be said that the Wesleys entered into an experience as pioneers enter into a new country, and what they discovered with heart-searching and tears is easier for us to find. There are senses in which that is true. But do we find it? What is an undeniable fact is that these men, with all their practice of piety and admirable home training, felt there was something lacking. And it must not be forgotten that in their pre-conversion days they were not altogether without Christian experience. They prayed and believed their prayers

were answered. Other people thought of them as eminent for their devoutness. They were earnest missionaries striving to lead men to Christ, although depressingly incompetent of success. Their failure to do anything effective for God stands out in striking contrast to their unparalleled career of evangelistic triumphs after their evangelical conversion.

"Good people need conversion. Good people are not good enough. Salvation is not just being a nice man. Refinement and education, however valuable, are secondary things. Divine grace is primary. First things must be first. Mr. Weatherhead is right in his emphasis of the need of conversion among the educated children of Methodism, and right in telling us that this is God's work—not a mere determination of people to do right and 'help Christ,' but a realization that no effective Christian life can be lived apart from the saving grace of God."

WHAT WOULD YOU CALL THE FIFTH GOSPEL? PERHAPS YOU have never inquired about any fifth Gospel. If it exists it ought to be full of precious revelations. Now God gave to men certain messages which have come to bound up together in a book to which they may in general turn for instruction about Him and His ways with mankind in all time, for His will and how to do it, for knowledge of the great Mediator by whom they may come to Him, and for hope and strength. But it is not going too far to say that God, our Father through Christ, also gives in various ways, by His Spirit and through the experiences of the Christian life, individual revelations that apply to the needs of each one separately. This what Dr. A. J. Gossip, professor in the United Free Church College, Glasgow, has referred to when in a sermon he said, about a "fifth Gospel":

"Did you realize, even with Christ to help you, how wonderful God was, until you experienced it yourself? I confess I did not. I read now in the fifth Gospel, the gospel of my own experience.

"When things get a bit crooked and difficult for me, I light the lamp of memory and hold it up. I turn the pages of that fifth Gospel, which has just as marvelous things in it as any of the others for me. I remember how Christ spoke to my heart here, and how He called me there, and how He laid His hand upon me yonder. You need not chatter to me about higher criticism—it cannot beat the volume of my own experience. I

have gone to Jesus Christ about this and said: 'I did not understand. God is better than you promised me. You said, "Ask, and it shall be given you," but I did not ask, and it just came.' As Emerson says: 'I did not find my friends; the good God gave them to me.' I did not seek, yet I found. Some Buddhist has said: 'I was sitting like a beggar on a dunghheap, and I opened my hand, and the pearl of salvation was lying in it. God has passed by and put it there without my noticing.' I say to Christ: 'You said, "Knock, and it shall be opened," but I did not knock.' As Samuel Rutherford says, sometimes the soul is found asleep, and God comes swinging through the doors, and lays gifts beside the pillow, and he wakes and finds that God has been and gone, but His gifts are left. God is better than He promised; all the metaphors we can employ and all the pictures we paint are just suggestions. If you want to know what the sea is like, you may have to take the small puddle in a slum street which is all the poor slum child has to look at, as an illustration, but you realize it cannot convey the real thing. It is like that with our pictures and the goodness of God.

"We need this big vision, this experience, in our Sunday schools today. I am sick and tired of this sniveling about the failure of the Church; I want to hear more about the successes of the Master. If you know something of that in your own mind, you will have something to teach the children. Otherwise religion has nothing to say to you, and you had better hold your tongue. When I was a boy I was told not to expect too much from God—I must watch and wait. The Psalmist says: 'My eyes are growing blind watching for God.' Sometimes we have to do that. Says this man in the Psalms: 'That was not my experience; the very day I called he answered me.'

"Of course, it depends what you ask. If you just ask for your own wishes, you may not get them all, thank God. But if you have learned to pray to God for what He desires, the answer will come. I have proved God is our refuge and strength and we will find Him very near when we call. If you have passed through deep waters and found God true to His promises, you will teach, because you have something to say.

"There is no answer to anything that comes out of our own experiences. Have you had any experiences? Well, Christ expected us to have them."

IT IS LITTLE MORE THAN A PLATITUDE, THAT IN RELIGION THE results of reasoning, however correct, are not enough. Yet

this truth is largely undervalued even by many who would not deny it; more than this, it does not appear to be sensed at all by certain of the more intelligent. Whatever cannot be imparted and grasped by means of logical processes has little weight with them. Yet all reason must rest in its beginning on "immediate awareness"—on the direct experience of the thing itself.

There is solemn truth in the frequently heard Christian testimony of some convert, that he "can't tell" what a wonderful thing has come into his life. He is right. Neither his halting, perhaps ungrammatical, expressions nor the fine phrases of a scholar can more than hint at what took place in the divine-human reconciliation. Yet his very earnestness and insistence and the vast change in his life do carry the conviction that something of unspeakable comfort and power and hope has entered into his very being. It is not, then, any adequate account of such experience, but the convincing outward evidence of some tremendous change within, that gives Christian testimony its weight. The convert must leave it still a mystery—but a compelling mystery, a mystery that allures with a divine attraction.

A British preacher and essayist, Rev. Frank H. Ballard, writing lately on this point has said:

"The unmovable bedrock of Christian faith is Christian experience. Arguments not based on experience leave us cold. Arguments that are the result of experience always appeal to something more than the intellect. There is nothing duller than theology divorced from life. That is why we can never leave the apostle Paul alone. He annoys us when he reasons as a rabbi, and some folk say they have no patience with fanciful arguments. But he soon wins us back again as we realize that underneath his curious forms are vital experiences and thoughts that matter to-day as much as in his day. Ultimately the greatest apologists of Christianity are not those who reason most carefully, but those who experience most deeply—the men who have felt and seen and heard the things that cannot be expressed. The man who was merely reasoned into a creed yesterday may be reasoned out of it tomorrow. But one who has experienced the truths the creeds endeavor to express may change his creed and still retain his religion."

THE MISSION FIELD HAS FURNISHED NUMEROUS INSTANCES OF the failure of anything short of the Gospel of Christ to bring peace to earnest souls that have long sought for it. Let a man order his life as he will, devoting himself to the purest and loftiest meditation and also to good works, still there is something lacking. For his full satisfaction and development man needs not only the society of his fellows; he must have the divine companionship. A striking illustration of this fact is reported by Sadu Sundar Singh:

"I had been taught from childhood according to the Law and Commandments of God and, though I really wanted to live up to the Law, I found that I failed so often that at last I became hopeless. I knew that God was the Merciful and the Compassionate, but I got no peace. I saw clearly, whenever I thought of my sinful state, that God and heaven are holy and that, even if my sins were forgiven, I could never enter the presence of the Holy God so long as my sinful nature remained unchanged and unpurified. For years I studied the Quran, Hadis, and other holy books, that I might find how to get rid of the old nature and how to obtain salvation and new life, but all my efforts were in vain. But I thank the God of Love that, even before I had begun to search for him, he was already seeking for me. Even when I had found him, and he had found me, I did not fully know him till I was born again. Now I know him whose likeness is in me and who, since the foundation of the world, has been mine and I his. My heart is now full of peace, for I have found the real Islam, which is Jesus Christ, who was crucified and now lives forever. Now I am spending the rest of my life in his service."

THE DEMAND BECOMES MORE FREQUENT FROM CHRISTIAN leaders, that the layman must bear his own testimony to the power of the Gospel. The priesthood of believers is no meaningless phrase in Christian history. Yet in how many churches is the duty of proclaiming the Gospel and bearing witness to its power left entirely with the preacher. The question naturally arises, How far is the ministry itself responsible for this state of affairs? Dr. Robert E. Speer has, through *The Christian Advocate*, laid upon laity and ministry alike the importance of developing the work of lay preaching:

"Laymen are bound to propagate their religion by speaking about it, by preaching it, in fact. Telling men the gospel, explaining what Christ can be to a man, is preaching, as Scriptural as any preaching can be made. Ministers ought to make this plain, and lay the duty of such preaching upon all their laymen, and teach them how to do it. It makes no difference if it is done haltingly. A broken testimony from a laborer to his friend is likely to be more effective than a smooth and conclusive Sunday morning sermon. The true ideal of Christian evangelism is the propagation of Christianity, not by public preachers so much as by private conversation and the testimony of common men."

EMOTION IS THE BOGEY OF A LARGE PROPORTION OF OUR MINISTERS and churches. Anything like a sincere and fervent response from the pew would upset the morning performance in many a pulpit. The sermon is often entirely correct in theology, logical in thought, and fine in delivery; yet it convicts no one of sin and convinces of nothing in particular. It lacks force, power, fire, grip; it sounds reasonable but moves no one to action, like a command uttered without authority. What is the trouble? Let an anonymous pastor, writing in *The Congregationalist* upon the need of spiritual power in the church, give his answer:

"St. Francis arrested the attention of his generation by his absolute divorce of religion from institutions that cost money, his entire cutting off of his own life from desire for place or pelf, his utter concentration upon the spiritual needs of men. It was a dramatized revolt against a mechanized, businesslike conception of religion. It was the method that had been adopted by his Master before him. And before Jesus and St. Francis, those vivid men, the Hebrew prophets, saved religion by doing the same sort of thing. Prophets and saviors in all ages and all lands have known that the fire of religion must be substituted for the mere business of religion, if religion is to be a living force. They have known that religion, when it really affects the world, does so because it is a passion and not a commercial enterprise; an irrepressible surge of life, and not the hardened, juiceless product of an institution maintained by authority or the use of clever method.

"It looks now as if nothing would renew religion in America

and Europe, and make it a vivid power in men's lives, save some fresh manifestation of the Franciscan passion and manner. So long as the ministry is looked upon as just as much a business as—salesmanship, for example, it will affect the world about as salesmanship does. So long as the mass of the people who make up the churches treat the Church as another form of club life, there is not much likelihood that the Church will have an influence much different from that of a club. So long as one man regards the ministry about as another regards brokerage (that is, as his way of making as good a living as possible and getting through life as comfortably as possible), the present unsatisfactory condition of the churches is likely to continue, with the estrangement of the multitudes everywhere and the restlessness and unhappiness of the ministry."

"The working out of the revised conception of the ministry is not to be looked for in the Church itself—from its members at large. The responsibility for doing that belongs to those who have made it their business to be leaders in the development of spiritual life. The story of St. Francis at least suggests ways of experimentation. Detachment from the ordinary desires and ambitions of typical life seems to have been always a necessary condition of commanding spiritual power and influence. The cultivation of such detachment is a first step toward finding a further answer to the problem of bettering the present religious condition."

THE CHURCH AS AN ORGANIZATION HAS ITS FAULTS, BUT NO satisfactory substitute for it can be found. It can hardly be denied that one may be a Christian and yet be a member of no church; however, it may be noted that such Christians do not seem to be doing any very notable work in advancing the cause of their Lord among men. In any great movement men need fellowship and organized endeavor. Dr. Charles E. Raven, Canon of Liverpool and Chaplain to the King, has written in *A Wanderer's Way*:

"At present religion is identified with churchmanship in the minds of men, and if they reject the latter they usually reject the former with it. Some would have us forswear the ancient institutions and seek God outside them—which means that our search will start with an antichristian basis and be deprived of the genuine treasures of experience and devotion which organized Christianity still possesses. For me at one

time, and for very many still, that is the only honest course. Indeed I agree with them that some day we may outgrow institutionalism; is it not written of the City of God that there is no temple there? But that day, if it ever comes, is not yet. A church of some sort is indispensable, and it is easier and wiser and more charitable to reform that which exists than to devise a new one, as any candid student of the 'fancy religions' of to-day will admit."

THIS IS AN AGE WHEN CULTS OF ALL SORTS FLOURISH, SOME WITH resounding names; but it has remained for a secular journal to give an apt designation to the most widespread cult of all. The interest of *The Saturday Review of Literature* is of course primarily in literature as such, but in dealing with conditions that affect literature it often enters other fields. Not long since its opening editorial referred to our age as having made a "cult of toleration." This just about hits it. With us "anything goes," so long as it does not actually disturb us in our business of living life in our own way.

It is at least odd that, in a time when we hear so much about social consciousness, social responsibility, social service, social betterment, and all the rest, there should be so little concern about the social effect of individual views and conduct. Yet what our ambitious social organizations seek to build up in the way of finer and nobler community life, individual habits are busy pulling down. What has contributed to such a state in our generation? The editorial referred to supplies an explanation:

"Of all ages ours is perhaps the most tolerant. Other ages have been tolerant from incapacity to be otherwise, from ignorance, from indifference, from licentiousness, but ours is so of deliberation. We have indeed made a cult of toleration, perhaps to the point where toleration is no longer a virtue. Partly we are tolerant because civilization has grown so complex that to resent what is not directly suited to our inclinations would consume all our energies; partly, because as a result of its intricacy we have learned that in order to live we must let live. But largely we are tolerant because the spirit of science has descended upon us, and science has taught us the fallacy of believing that theories are immutable.

"It was impossible, of course, that an age which replaced faith with science should retain its moral codes unchanged. Human nature could no longer be measured by the same yardstick when it was seen in part at least to be the victim of glandular deficiencies as when it had seemed to be entirely a thing of the spirit. As soon as the human being no longer appeared unquestionably the captain of his soul, but was rather the resultant of chemistry and experience, conduct could no more be fitted into a cast-iron sheath of custom. If man sinned, he sinned as much because of himself as despite himself. And if that was so, the sin was no longer to be regarded as sin.

"But an interest in science could not stop with theory, it must proceed to experimentation. And experimentation, again, meant a further loosening of the shackles of convention, or at least an excuse for lenity toward the relaxing of traditional standards. A new attitude developed toward society which regarded it as a vast laboratory where human relationships were in process of shaping, and where precedent was not of necessity the lodestar of action. So now today it has become fashionable to be 'open-minded,' stupid to be straitlaced, ridiculous to be prudish. This is the canon in the year of grace 1929.

"It is the canon, we hasten to add, of the sophisticates. The masses of the nation are undoubtedly still living if not in the full light of Victorian morality at least in the shadow of it. But in a democracy like ours the opinions of the sophisticates bode much for the nation, for by example, through literature, through the press, they seep down into the remotest of our communities."

IT IS NO INFREQUENT THING FOR THE CHURCH TO RECEIVE A deserved rebuke from a source entirely outside her own ministry and other leadership. At the convening of the recent Presbyterian Assembly at Ottawa, Premier Mackenzie King made an address, which included certain observations deeper than those polite commonplaces that so often make up a speaker's remarks on like occasions. As *The Evangelical Christian and Missionary Witness* remarks, the Premier spoke as a prophet when he said:

"The greatest endeavour in the lives of men should be cultivation of what I term the right attitude. And in obtaining that right attitude there is no influence comparable to that

of the Church—a Church not diverted by this sideshow and that sideshow, but concerned with the eternal verities.

"I frequently view with cynicism, contempt, and even grief, the advertisements I see outside some churches, trying to compete with the movies, because I feel that the people who are drawn by that sort of thing go away with as little permanent profit as those attending some other forms of entertainment.

"Let the Church get down to realities; back to her true mission of spiritual things. And if the Church does that then the application of religion will take care of itself.

"If I were a preacher I would preach on this text every Sunday of my life: 'Let this mind be in you which is also in Christ Jesus'—that mind which is concerned with intellectual and spiritual things."

THE CHANGES OF THE PAST THIRTY YEARS HAVE BEEN SO PROFOUND that, to young people of this century, the generation immediately following our Civil War seems to have lived in a rather benighted age. Someone wrote to Professor David Smith of Belfast expressing his difficulties with the modern disposition to sweep away faith in the supernatural as manifested in various Scriptural incidents. In the course of his answer, through *The British Weekly*, Dr. Smith paid his respects to those who can see little of importance or greatness in the closing decades of the last century. The list of eminent men he gives is not drawn up with a view to their religious beliefs, but as a reminder that modern scholarship has no monopoly of intellect. He also, in these excerpts, gives his view of the kind of learning the church needs:

"It occurred to me recently on hearing a sneer at 'the Victorian Age' how ill it becomes us thus to depreciate our predecessors. Whatever their limitations, think of the names which adorn the record of the later years of last century in every domain of intellectual activity: De Quincey, Carlyle, Macaulay, George Borrow, Keble, Newman, the Brownings, Tennyson, Dickens, Thackeray, the Brontës, Kingsley, Ruskin, Matthew Arnold, Trollope, George Eliot, Coventry Patmore, the Rossettis, Swinburne, R. L. Stevenson; Milman, Thirwall, Grote, Freeman, Froude, Gardiner, Green; Brewster, Faraday, Hugh Miller, Mill, Darwin, Tyndall, Huxley, Kelvin. A generation ago what teachers we had in our colleges and universities!

Their names were household words: David Masson, John Stuart Blackie, the Cairds, R. C. Jebb, Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort, Robertson Smith, Fairbairn, A. B. Davidson, A. B. Bruce, Henry Drummond, George Adam Smith (still happily with us). How few have arisen worthy to rank with such as these! "There were giants in the earth in those days"; and the race has dwindled and diminished in our own. Our generation abounds in clever men, but its great men are few.

"And nowhere is the dearth sorer than in the domain of sacred learning. It is perhaps a phase—pray God, a passing phase—of the social unsettlement which culminated in the long and ruinous struggle of the World War, and which has diverted men's minds to the reconstruction of the fabric of civilisation and the application of the scientific discoveries of earlier days; but whatever the reason, the fact is that little remains of the profound scholarship, the massive erudition which is the fruit of patient and loving devotion to the pursuit of knowledge."

"What the Church needs in these days next to a spirit of grace and of supplication is a Renaissance, a revival of godly learning. 'I am persuaded,' wrote Martin Luther, 'that without skill in letters it is quite impossible for pure theology to stand; even as heretofore, when they were ruined, it shared their miserable overthrow. Nay, I see that never has there been any notable revelation of God's Word unless He has first prepared the way by the rise and flourishing of languages and letters as Baptist forerunners.' One blessed use of sanctified scholarship is that by discovering 'the inexhaustible fullness of Holy Scripture' it enables us to welcome without disquietude the larger light which is continually breaking in upon earnest minds and perceive how, so far from discrediting the ancient and imperishable faith, it illumines it and reveals therein a deeper and diviner truth. There is wisdom in the old aphorism that 'a good textuary is a good divine.' The best apologetic for the historic faith is a deeper understanding of the sacred record of the historic revelation."

CHRISTIANITY HAS PROSPERED, IN THE DISTINCTLY RELIGIOUS sense, even when foes have been outside her gates. Spiritual destruction comes from disloyalty within. It is strange that more of our preachers and leaders do not realize this. There is considerable religious teaching at present which has the effect of releasing the hearer from his sense of accountability

to God. This is not to say that any such result is intended; but you cannot weaken faith in divine revelation, in Christian tradition, in the cross as the only way to God, in the certainty of judgment for sin, and yet expect your hearer to retain a compelling interest in religion.

Such teaching is by no means peculiar to America. *The Modern Churchman*, England, has given a quite gloomy quotation from an editorial in *Theology* respecting conditions in the Church of England. Indeed it is so depressing that one hopes it is overdrawn:

"It may be doubted whether the outlook for the Church of England was ever more dark, or its condition more insupportable to all true believers in the Christian faith, than it is to-day. A century ago Keble and his friends were confronted with a relatively clear issue; the nation had apostatized from Christianity through its alliance with the new liberalism, and the Church must awake to the reality of its vocation, and emphasise its distinctness from the world. To-day the spirit of apostasy is going to work by far subtler methods. It is not the nation but the Church itself which is to be false to the Gospel of Christ. Not by open attack, but by flattery; not by burning down Bishops' palaces, but by filling them with men who can be trusted to deny the faith they promised to defend; not by threats of disestablishment, but by the firmer establishment of heresy in the high offices of the Church—it is thus that to-day the citadel of English religion is being undermined."

THERE MUST BE SOME SIGNIFICANCE IN THE GROWING INTEREST in evangelism. The theme is prominent in recent books and articles, while definite movements are launched to promote interest and endeavor in this supreme field of Christian activity. A great revival is no man-made affair; it cannot be brought about by organizations or committees or drives. But these efforts may succeed in bringing the church to her knees, and when this occurs there is reason to hope for that outpouring of the Spirit which both church and world so sadly need.

The editor of *The Life of Faith*, J. Kennedy Maclean, has given in *The Bible To-Day* a brief survey of the spiritual outlook in Great Britain. The picture he paints of present

religious life in that country could be applied with little or no change to conditions in the United States. Human nature is the same everywhere, so that if these words of this writer reveal a smoldering spiritual life in that country, that promises to burst into a consuming flame, we may pray with renewed hope for the same thing here:

"So far I have painted the picture in somber colors as the conditions of the hour demand; but, fortunately, there is another side to it, and the gloom is relieved by the glory. The darkest hour, we are frequently reminded, is that which precedes the dawn, and we do not forget other periods in our history when the forces of indifference and materialism seemed entrenched beyond all possibility of replacement. Then, when the hosts of evil were rejoicing in what seemed to them their complete and overwhelming victory, the breath of God breathed upon the dead bones and they were clothed with life.

"Remembering, therefore, what great things the Lord has done for us in other decadent ages, I look around for signs of hope, and I find them in certain facts. First of all, I put it on record to the glory of God that wherever His message of salvation is faithfully proclaimed in the power of the Spirit, the preacher can always rely upon a crowded and eager congregation. With all our indifference to the things that matter most, there is yet a hunger and a thirst after God and the pardon He so freely bestows, and in the city of London, as in other large cities and towns up and down the land, there are churches at whose doors long queues of people are to be found patiently standing every Sunday evening. They want the truth, and they go where they know they will find it. Only a few days ago, I was discussing with one of our eminent provincial preachers the present state of religion in England, and he described to me his own experience. Every Sunday evening his church, which seats over a thousand, is filled in every corner. A winter or two ago, desirous of reaching a wider congregation, he engaged the local music hall with a seating capacity of two thousand. After his own regular service at 6:30, he proceeded to the music hall, and always found a full house awaiting him and his message.

"And the hunger of which I write is finding expression in other directions. Within a few days there will be starting out from London a band of Pilgrim Preachers, who, for the past dozen years, have been spending the summer months in the

open-air up and down the country. The leader of that band is a personal friend of my own, and, from time to time, he reports to me the wonderful things that the Lord does through His faithful servants as they proclaim the Gospel of redeeming love to all who gather to listen. This is no place for details; all that need be said is that these reports read like chapters from the Acts of the Apostles."

"Finally, I find ground for hope and confidence in the knowledge that God's loyal people, acquainted with the situation as I have presented it in the earlier part of this article, are longing and praying for a new day of divine grace and power. Here and there, as I know from letters sent to me, they are taking counsel together and pouring out their souls before God in an agony of intercession for a spiritual quickening. They can rest neither day nor night as long as the Lord whom they serve is despised and rejected of men; and since they plead in faith they believe that He will graciously hear and answer."

THE SPECIALIST HAS BEEN DEVELOPED IN ABOUT ALL BRANCHES of human activity, so that it is not surprising to find him in the religious field. And there is evidently a place for him. Why should the long and painstaking studies of child and adolescent psychology, not to mention the improvements in methods of teaching, be applied only in the public schools? Surely the Church School has a right to these things. Fortunately our churches are coming to realize this, and the professional religious educator is now among us. Naturally some things must be guarded against. The spiritual must not be crowded out by the intellectual; the interest in method must not obscure the great central aim—to bring the young to know Jesus Christ as their Saviour and Lord.

There is another unfavorable tendency to be avoided, and that is the effect of the presence of the specialist and of his technical knowledge upon the layman. There appears to be some danger that the lay worker in the Church School which employs a professional religious educator will be disposed to let the latter shoulder all the responsibility. This tendency has already moved the *International Journal of Religious Education* to give this editorial warning:

"Speaking of the specialist, we are moved to remark that we have perhaps been too ready to accept him as the final solution of all our difficulties. Churches have sometimes been too eager to place all educational responsibility upon one professionally trained person and let the layman who formerly bore the load go merrily on his way in blessed unconcern. We believe in the specialist. We want him to have a big place in the program of religious education in the future. We believe that many phases of religious education are so technical that they require professional training for their successful execution. We believe also, however, that there is a large place for the layman in the church program of religious education. His talents, his experience in the business and professional world, his freedom from the sins of professionalism put him in a position to render a unique service which will greatly enhance the work of the specialist.

"What is true of the work in the local church is also true of organizations for the advancement of religious education. A tremendous impetus was given to better religious education when the professional worker entered the ranks of the organizations for its promotion. Something very vital was lost, however, when at the same time, as happened in so many cases, the layman felt that there was no longer a place for him. Somewhat tardily, but not the less surely, we are beginning to see that an all-professional organization may be no more successful than an all-layman organization. Each in his own way may make his contribution to the common cause. Let us remind ourselves that religious education was nurtured through its early years, not by professionals, but by laymen. Perhaps those who were so essential to its early life will continue to be equally essential to its further development through its increasing maturity."

TO JUDGE FROM THE VAST AMOUNT OF DISCUSSION DEVOTED TO the subject of education, the ideal system has not yet been worked out. But at any rate various faults have been recognized and are by way of being remedied. Overcrowded class rooms, professors who are not true teachers, and the one-sided recitation system are listed among the obstacles to best results in our colleges and universities.

In a recent issue of *The Forum* Hamilton Holt considered these defects and the means he has adopted to remedy them at

Rollins College, of which he is President. He severely criticizes the present craze for "research." Many professors neglect teaching in order to engage in "original research," to help them attain an advanced degree and perhaps some other recognition. As President Holt says:

"To-day we find hosts of men engaged in the laborious, time-consuming, and unprofitable task of writing uninspired theses on unimportant subjects and trying to learn more and more about less and less; while in teaching orientation courses they take the opposite extreme and, as a Harvard professor recently said, try to make their students learn less and less about more and more."

It is worth while to note, then, how things are done at Rollins, as indicated in President Holt's brief outlines of his own methods:

"Speaking for myself alone, I have begun my attempt to remedy the three sins of the modern American college by limiting the student body at Rollins College to seven hundred boys and girls. In so doing, we aim to perfect and dignify the small college at a time when our small colleges are trying to become large colleges and our large colleges are trying to become universities. We are centering our energies on the college and are not, as are most institutions of to-day, specializing and emphasizing graduate and professional work.

"I have tried to select our professors with a view solely to their teaching ability and therefore I have given far greater weight to the opinions of their present and former students than to all the eulogies of their faculty colleagues. As our teaching corps expands, I hope to invite only those professors to join our circle who have that imagination, that nobility of character, and that genuine gift for teaching which alone can inspire youth. I shall feel that I have failed as President of Rollins College if I cannot find such men and procure them for our staff.

"I have tried to solve the problem of bringing the teacher and taught together by abolishing both the recitation and the lecture systems *in toto*, and establishing in their place the so-called 'Two-Hour Conference Plan.' This proposal has for its purpose, and hopes to effect, continuous consultation and coöperation between teacher and student. The theory behind this innovation is that the student's mind is immature, that

frequently he does not know how to study, and that he most needs the professor when he is preparing his lesson and not after he has learned or failed to learn it. Thus the maximum impact of the instructor's personality will be exerted on the student's mind at the time when it is most needed. This does not mean, of course, that the teacher solves every difficulty when the student gets stuck. Only a foolish teacher would do that. It does mean, however, that someone will be at hand ready to aid the student when aid is necessary. And it means that the waste of unsupervised time for which student life has become notorious will be largely eliminated."

THE EVANGELICAL CHURCH, AS A WHOLE, IS STRANGELY INDIFFERENT to the vast importance of Christian literature of the right kind and abundance. Every non-Christian and anti-Christian doctrine that attains any success worth mentioning makes much of its press. Yet here the church lags. A good part of our present books and periodicals are devoted to the organizational and educational sides of Christian propaganda and to the merely academic and philosophic aspects of the faith. We need more of clearly informing and inspiring spiritual literature. Upon returning from his fourth world tour Dr. John R. Mott laid before a group of American missionary leaders twelve propositions respecting the needs of missionary work, as he saw them. Upon the need of literature he said:

"Another important thing which we must do is to advance the solution of the Christian literature problem. The amount of available literature for the clergy and educated youth is inadequate and untimely in virtually every field. We should discover the ablest writers and secure their release for this kind of work. There is also the problem of getting literature distributed and used. We have allowed the initiative to be taken over from the Christians into the hands of the non-Christians in this matter of literature in India, China and Japan. This is alarming. I trace the cause to our divisions. There is enough brain and enough money among us to make a plan and enlist the co-operation of scholarship to meet this tremendous need. I am speaking of the great body of Christian literature that is needed. The bookstores in Japan are well stocked with non-Christian literature, and scarcely any Christian literature is in evidence. We have the leaders, but we must release them, and

the work must be done interdenominationally, with co-ordinate thinking and planning."

IT WOULD PAY THE CHRISTIAN ELEMENT OF OUR POPULATION TO create a great daily paper, endowed if need be, that would not only give all the important news of the day without sensationalism or pandering to morbid tastes, but would also give the truth about religious and moral affairs both accurately and fully. It is impossible today to get at the real inwardness of prohibition enforcement if we depend on the newspapers. They are largely hostile or indifferent; they magnify failures and minimize successes; and their statistics are nothing to tie to. *The Christian Century* has thus editorially summarized the "dry killings," of which an unfriendly press has made so much:

"That there should ever be fatalities in connection with the enforcement of law is regrettable, but the occasional occurrence of such incidents should not be allowed to discredit either the law or its enforcers until some reasonable evidence has been submitted to prove that one or the other was to blame. Bank robbers, burglars and hold-up men not infrequently put themselves in positions where their destruction becomes inevitable, and the case of rum-runners and bootleggers is not different. The killing of even a criminal is unfortunate, but not so unfortunate as giving them a free hand unrestrained by fear of consequences. A tremendous uproar has been raised about 'dry killings.' The *Christian Century* has given a thorough analysis of one *cause celebre*, the DeKing case, in which it turned out that the wet press had grossly perverted the record to make medicine against prohibition. The Congressional Record for June 14, 1929, contains a list of all prohibition officers killed in the discharge of duty and all persons killed by them and the details of each case. The persons killed by officers number 155. An analysis of this record by Atticus Webb shows that these 155 were by no means innocent victims, as usually represented. Fifty-five of them were already shooting at officers before they were fired upon; 32 drew their gun first but were fatally slow on the trigger; 10 shot it out with officers but the evidence as to which drew and fired first is inconclusive; 12 had attacked officers with weapons other than guns. Most of the others were fired upon while attempting to avoid arrest or lawful search. It appears that six innocent parties have been killed.

Two of these were automobile fatalities, two were killed in a boat collision, one was struck by a stray bullet, and one was killed with a gun in his hand. Reckless shooting by law enforcement officers is not to be tolerated. But it appears that there has been very little of it."

WHEN IT IS FOUND THAT ONE HAS BEEN DESTROYING SOME OF the evidence, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that he is afraid his case will not bear close examination. This has been the charge made against Christian Science. Things written and printed concerning the life of its founder and her activities in launching the new cult have disappeared in mysterious ways, according to various writers who have made a study of the organization. In reviewing Edwin Franden Dakin's new book, *Mrs. Eddy: The Biography of a Virginal Mind*, Winfred Ernest Garrison gives in *The Christian Century* this summary of these activities:

"At first glance it does not seem that it should be very difficult to write an accurate biography of any prominent person whose life, extending from a date no more remote than 1820 down to our own times, was spent in an area as literate as the vicinity of Boston. There must be plenty of extant materials—personal reminiscences, private correspondence, public records, and all the other standard forms of source material. But in the case of Mary Baker Eddy, there are extraordinary obstacles in the way of the biographer seeking the truth and nothing but the truth; and most of them are not natural obstacles. To begin with, Mrs. Eddy's own story of her early life, as given in 'Retrospection and Introspection,' is notoriously and demonstrably inaccurate. The delusions of grandeur from which she suffered reflected themselves back upon her early experiences to produce a wholly idealized picture. When the board of lectureship was organized to control all propaganda from the home office, one of the specified duties of its lecturers was 'to bear testimony to the facts pertaining to the life of the Pastor Emeritus.' But it is quite evident that, in view of the unique status claimed for the Pastor Emeritus as the mouth-piece of God and the founder of the true religion, dogmatic necessity entirely outweighed historical evidence. Even before this, loyal adherents had scoured New England to collect damaging documentary evidence in regard to Mrs. Eddy's early

career and render it inaccessible to future biographers. When the financial settlement was made with her son after her death, one condition was the return of all the letters which she had written to him. Many of the most important books are very rare, and have been purposely made so, The Dickey 'Memoirs,' published in 1927, have been reduced to two surviving copies in the United States. The Milmine 'Life' is almost equally rare and its plates have been bought up and destroyed. The first edition of Dresser's 'Quimby Manuscripts,' containing Mrs. Eddy's letters to Quimby, survives in only three or four examples. The biographer, therefore, has to contend against a great deal of manufactured mystery."

AFTER ALL THAT HAS BEEN WRITTEN UPON THE TREATY AND THE concordat between Italy and the papacy, the intelligent observer's attitude respecting their future relations may be expressed by a question mark. The so-called "agreement" of last year seems to lack the elements of permanence. It is regarded as a truce, rather than a treaty, between forces inherently antagonistic. The underlying cause of this weakness in the arrangement has been put quite tersely by *The New Republic* in this outline of the historic attitude of the Roman Church and of the situation now:

"There is a sense in which the Catholic Church can never be reconciled with nationalism. Being Catholic, it must have regard to the interests of nationalism's enemies; being possessed of secular attributes, it must seek to exercise and extend them; being a church, it must seek to restrain the ardor of the young to kill one another.

"There was a time when the Catholic Church was virtually co-terminous with the Roman Empire, which was pretty nearly co-terminous with the known world. And the Church, claiming divine authority over men, delegated that portion of its authority which concerned civil government to temporal rulers, while reserving the right to intervene whenever it deemed it necessary (as it frequently did). From the Catholic point of view, this theocratic empire was later split into nationalisms which really belonged together all the time. Ideally, this world-wide authority of the Church has never been impaired. And the Church has never admitted that its claim to unrestricted moral authority can be divorced from its right to counsel and guide the worldly actions of temporal rulers.

"In other words, as has so often been said, here are two absolutisms facing one another, and their claims, to say the least, overlap and conflict. The concept of a free church in a free state has never been really at home in Latin countries. The question has been not so much to find the proper sphere of religion (which some believe to have been solved in America) but to find a fruitful and workable relation between the two sovereignties."

WHAT IS THE CAUSE OF THE DRYING UP, IN AMERICA, OF THE springs of the higher human interests? We have, it is true, culture, literature, music, art, after a fashion, but our attainments are largely superficial and impermanent. What best seller in fiction today, for example, will be in any demand ten years from now, if it is even remembered? Yet the great novelists of the last century are still read. No country on earth has more practical intelligence, more energy, and more abundant resources, so that seemingly it ought to encourage the best in everything. In theory it does do so. Where is so much money spent on education, on reading, on travel—on all that should lift the mind above the sordid levels?

Yet, beyond material things that minister to comfort and pleasure, a strange blight seems to rest upon our productiveness. A paralysis has seized our finer powers. Why do we fall short of the larger vision of life, even as it concerns this present world? Of course, many forces are at work upon the life of a great people, yet there must be some outstanding one, and we think that the answer has been given by James Truslow Adams, business man, traveler, and writer, in his article, *A Business Man's Civilization*, published in *Harper's Magazine*. His whole explanation of America's cultural decline can be indicated by one word—business.

After showing that Europe, through tradition and other conditions, has developed certain checks to the complete business domination of all sides of life, he proceeds to point out America's lack of these saving factors and what has consequently happened to us. From a paper that supplies one of the best perspectives of present American civilization appearing

in recent years we take several excerpts. After speaking of certain offsetting elements in English life, Mr. Adams says:

"In America from the beginning there has been an entirely different social scene, although in many respects it was more variegated in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries than it is to-day. Neither the best nor the worst of feudalism, however, was transplanted to the colonies. We fell short of developing an aristocracy or a permanent landed gentry. With the exception of a few colonial experiments, there has never been an established church. Politics, save in a few rare cases, have ceased to attract first-rate men as a career, and there is none in either diplomacy, which is usually only an episode, or in the civil service, which holds no position worth striving for. The rewards of a lifetime spent in the army or navy are negligible. On the other hand, we have had the richest virgin continent in the world to exploit, and the prizes for a successful business career, measured in money and power, have been such as are undreamed of in European business. Generation after generation the opportunities, instead of becoming less, have become colossally greater. The result has been that most of the energy, ability, and ambition of the country has found its outlet, if not its satisfaction, in business."

As to the results of the fact that "the business man's standard of values has become that of the civilization at large," he continues:

"Owing in large measure to this, to the emphasis placed in America by the universities on equipment and plant, and to the constant need of money for endowments and upkeep, they also have come under the sway of the successful business men to an extent undreamed of in Europe. If the equipment of European universities seems meager and poor in comparison with America, no one can claim that the work being done in them is inferior; and partly due to the smaller demands for money for constant building and expense, and partly to the presence in the European social system of important classes other than business men, the universities there are far more independent of business domination and ideals than they are with us. The entire religious system of the country, also, is in the same relation of dependence upon the business man. In the absence of any establishment of large endowments from the past, the churches of every denomination are dependent upon the richer members of their congregation for their support.

As for politics, the relations between parties, legislatures, and the business interests are too notorious to call for specific comment. The dominant economic and social power of any country is bound to be the dominant political one. If agriculture, for example, is now the Cinderella of American prosperity and government interest, the cause is in part to be found in the fact that the number of men engaged in agriculture has dropped from 90 per cent of the total in 1790 to 36 per cent in 1910 and 29 per cent in 1920. The professions, as we shall note later, are also rapidly coming under the domination of the business man's type of civilization.

"Thus unlike Europe, the business man with us finds himself the dominant power in the life of the nation and almost alone in his control over the direction of its entire life, economic, social, intellectual, religious, and political. It is a situation that, so far as I know, is unique in history and well worth analyzing."

After following out the effect of this lopsided development of a great people in its effect upon the professions and upon the economic life of the people, in the enormous increase of business itself, under the cloak of "service," the writer comes to this conclusion:

"Civilizations rest fundamentally upon ideas. These ideas to be effective must be those of the dominant classes in the civilization. In making the business men the dominant and sole class in America, that country is making the experiment of resting her civilization on the ideas of business men. The other classes, dominated by the business one, are rapidly conforming in their philosophy of life to it. The business man, in so far as he is more than a business type, in so far as he is a fully rounded personality (as, I repeat, many of them now are), owes that development of himself outside his work to the work of other classes in the past or present. If those classes become merged in his own, whither can even he himself look for his extra-occupational development? If the leaders are not humanely rounded personalities, civilized rather than barbarian, what shall be expected of the mass which patterns itself upon them? In a word, can a great civilization be built up or maintained upon the philosophy of the counting-house and the sole basic idea of a profit?"

DURING THE PAST SUMMER THE CHURCHMAN DEVOTED CONSIDERABLE space to the present evils of the moving picture business and to the empty pretenses of those responsible respecting improvement. Mr. Will Hays and ex-Governor Milliken were the particular objects of that paper's criticisms, since they have been put in positions by the movie industry where they should exercise a powerful influence in favor of decency. *The Congregationalist* has come to the support of *The Churchman*, and in the course of an editorial comment upon the latter paper's articles said:

"A correspondent who upholds the *Churchman's* position says in commenting upon the matter, 'All the investigation needed is a visit to any movie house.' That in a somewhat extreme form is very much our own reaction. In fact, it is hardly necessary to visit the movie houses. The advertisements of the screen plays seem to carry a sufficient indictment. A few weeks ago the present writer, whose family had joined him at the office after a busy day, planned a visit to some movie on the way home. He was amazed to discover that in the whole city of Boston there was not a single picture, so far as the advertisements at all showed its nature and quality, that seemed fit entertainment for a boy of thirteen. Everything, without exception, was manifestly either overwrought sex stuff or crime-dominated melodrama. Compromise was made finally upon what seemed to be the least objectionable show. It turned out to be one that moved almost entirely in the world of crime, but which was artistically so poor and so extravagantly overdone as to have little effect, except that of exasperation, upon anybody.

"No doubt there are many good films. We have seen some of them. But why, with the high profession made in connection with the work of Will Hays and ex-Governor Milliken, should there be so much that is not only non-ideal and non-artistic, but so much that is positively objectionable from the standpoint of decency and wholesome influence? Without raising question regarding the proportion of good film pictures, it may very properly be asked why, in view of the high professions made, so much that is decidedly unwholesome and objectionable, continues to appear?

"We refer to Mr. Hays and ex-Governor Milliken because they have been set forward by the movie interests as inter-

mediaries between that industry and an enlightened public. In their work they have made a great deal of appeal to the Church and other idealistic organizations and agencies. If we judge the results of their work by a high standard, it is because they have themselves, in their high professions, set that standard.

"Frankly, it seems to us time for a showdown. We have been slow to speak of it, but we have felt for some time that an effort was being made to put over a great deal of bluff on the churches."

THE PROFOUND CHANGES THAT HAVE COME OVER THE WORLD during the past thirty years are by no means confined to material things; our very attitudes toward once seemingly permanent human arrangements have been shifting. We abandon and even condemn ideas and conventions that our fathers held with a sort of religious conviction and with unshakable tenacity; and we adopt customs and habits that would have filled them with horror and alarm. Perhaps many of these changes are good and in the direction of improvement, while some are, to say the least, doubtful.

The Spectator, London, has lately called attention to the readjustment of the British mind respecting tradesmen, and we imagine that this quiet revolution is not confined to Great Britain. It is the spirit of the age, and the man who produces anything, from a volume of sermons to a patent shoe polish, is expected as a matter of course to give no small consideration to "what there is in it." The aspiring individual who "writes because he must," who follows "art for art's sake," who toils painstakingly at anything "for the sake of the work," is becoming an ever greater exception. Is society the gainer by the change? But to quote *The Spectator's* comment referred to, as illustrating this reversal of public judgment:

"Sir Chartres Biron delivered himself recently of a somewhat cutting reference to booksellers as mere 'tradesmen.' This description loses its edge, however, if we remember that we are not Victorians. We have different social values and even a peer runs a shop to-day without losing caste. In fact, this is precisely where the Georgian Age has progressed furthest. Fifty years ago a man was 'something in the City.'

He dared not be more precise in good Society—at any rate, if he wished to remain in it.

“Then there was the nice distinction between wholesale and retail. If you sold ribbons by the hundredweight your wife could still hold her head high, but sell them by the yard and you and your family were beyond the pale.

“All this is sheer humbug. As a book-salesman I am grateful to Sir Chartres for this candour—of course nearly all of us are tradesmen and proud of our trade. It is a goodly company and includes Benvenuto Cellini, Rubens, Sheridan, and Wren. They were all tradesmen as well as artists, skilled sellers of their wares. For it is not essential that a tradesman should sell other people’s goods. Every time an artist executes a commission to paint a portrait he is doing a deal. He is not a whit the worse a painter because he accepts a high fee for his work. A barrister spends many years reading dull tomes and listening to dull pleadings not simply for the love of the Law but with fat fees in prospect. He barter his knowledge of cases and of human nature for the biggest cheque obtainable. The market-place is not localized in the City. It is like the motto of the Gunners—*Ubique*.

“Mr. Arnold Bennett pointed out the other day in the *Evening Standard* the futility of Art for Art’s sake as applied to literature. It almost invariably produces the dilettante—a person feeble in performance but big in promise.”

AS THESE LINES ARE WRITTEN THE GRAVE DISTURBANCE IN Palestine between the Jews and the Arabs appears to be quieted rather than settled. The prospect that one outcome of the Great War might be the building of a Jewish state in the Holy Land has had a strong appeal to the popular imagination. But it is difficult to create a nation by mandate, and especially when centuries of established views and habits on the part of a large body of people must be overcome. While the fury of the Moslem Arabs has aroused the indignation of Jew and Christian alike, it is significant that a few observers, at least, have lifted their voices in defense of the Arab claims. *The Daily Mail*, London, has emphatically protested against the whole scheme for making Palestine a national home for the Jews, and during the early days of the recent outburst it made this energetic statement:

"There are 750,000 Moslems in the country and only about 75,000 or 80,000 Jews. To maintain the privileged position of this small body, mostly recent immigrants from abroad, over the Arabs, who have been settled in the territory for centuries, British bayonets have to be constantly in evidence or readily available. As far back as March, 1922, Lord Northcliffe, after examining the conditions on the spot, warned the British nation of the gulf that yawned before it in Southwestern Asia. 'Look at Palestine,' he exclaimed. 'Do you know that we are on the verge of starting a war in Palestine?' With his unerring instinct for realities, Lord Northcliffe saw that there could be no permanent peace from the Jordan to the sea under the artificial system we have set up.

"The Government seems to be dealing energetically with the present outburst, which must, of course, be firmly repressed. But when order is restored the matter, in its larger aspect, must not be allowed to rest. The Ministry is not bound by a casual declaration made to a very unrepresentative Jewish group by Lord Balfour. We hope that Mr. MacDonald and his colleagues will waste no time in reopening the question, and that they will go closely into the whole outrageous folly of endeavoring—with British backing—to convert an old Arab State into a sham Jewish 'nation' at the expense of the British taxpayer."

In addition to the above we may add this comment, by William Yale, formerly advisor to the Commission on Mandates in Turkey, and published in the *Boston Evening Transcript*:

"In Palestine the Arabs outnumber the Jews by more than six to one. There as elsewhere the Jews are but an alien minority. And the tragedy of it is from the Jewish point of view that if by their brains and energy, their industry and capital they succeed in rehabilitating Palestine inevitably the Arab population benefiting from the improved economic condition will increase by leaps and bounds at a greater rate than the Jews can hope to multiply. Nor can the balance be redressed by immigration because a large influx of Jews has proved to be both an economic and a political impossibility. The harvest of their hopes and efforts is turning out to be Dead Sea fruit. One sympathizes with the Zionist ideal, one wishes that it might be realized, and one is deeply touched by the apparent frustration of the Jewish ageless dream.

"On the other hand, the Arabs also command one's sympathy. For centuries they have been in undisputed possession of 'the Land.' And even though they have for long been under the alien rule of the Turks, these conquerors from the north who brought ruin upon Palestine never attempted to dispossess the Arabs nor to supplant their culture. Palestine remained an Arab land. During the World War these people also had their dream of union and independence only to have their hopes dashed to the ground, the Arab provinces parcelled out among the Powers, and Palestine promised to an alien race. To the Arabs this settlement is a rank injustice which they bitterly resent and to which they refuse to be reconciled."

IT IS A SINGULAR FACT THAT THE STRUGGLE FOR GREATER liberty among men sometimes itself develops a blind and merciless tyranny. Russia furnishes an example. The Russia of the Czars was a land of oppression, an oppression that came to be more or less associated with the state church, and so with religion generally. In its ostensible effort to free men from one form of despotism Bolshevism has substituted another. It did not stop with the abolition of the power of the state church, but is now doing all it can to destroy all religion, even belief in God.

Since there is a strong religious element in the Russian soul, naturally religion could not be eliminated by fiat. However, the purpose to accomplish this ultimately is proceeding by measures that make anything like Christian propaganda more and more difficult. William Henry Chamberlain, who has lived continuously in Russia for a number of years, has been writing for *The Atlantic Monthly* a series of thoughtful and illuminating papers on Soviet Russia, and in one entitled *The Struggle for the Russian Soul* he makes very clear the trials of Russian Christians today. The Baptists have been especially active, and have suffered accordingly. The following extract not only gives some idea of the methods of the Soviet government, but is of particular interest as the group of Baptist workers Mr. Chamberlain refers to was evidently that led by Pastor Fetler, whose work in America and Russia has been followed by many with sympathetic interest:

"Several blows fell on the Baptists during the winter of 1928-1929. A group of some sixteen Baptists, Russian emigrants who had been trained in a Baptist seminary in Philadelphia, in America, and had returned to Russia in some irregular fashion in 1920 or 1921, were arrested in White Russia, where they maintained a coöperative farm, and charged with counter-revolutionary agitation. Shortly afterward a man named Shevchuk, alleged to be in the confidence of the Baptist communities in Ukraina, where this sect is especially strong, was arrested on the Soviet-Polish border, accused of espionage and plying a contraband trade. In the spring of 1929 the Baptist training college in Moscow found itself obliged, at least temporarily, to suspend activities, although at the time of writing I do not know whether or not it has been definitely and permanently closed.

"More important than these minor episodes was the new law regulating the activities of religious organizations in the Soviet Union, promulgated in the latter part of April, 1929. Two or three provisions of this law strike at the very heart of two main aspects of sectarian activity, the sending out of missionary propagandists from central headquarters and the extension of church activity into educational, recreational, and benevolent fields. Paragraph 19 of the law provides that 'the region of activity of ministers of cults, religious preachers, messengers, and so forth, is limited to the place of residence of the religious unit which they serve and the place of existence of the corresponding house of worship.' There is pretty definitely aimed at itinerant preachers and missionaries.

"Under paragraph 17 of the law, religious organizations are forbidden: '(a) to create mutual aid funds, coöperatives, productive societies, and, in general, to use the property in their possession for any ends except the satisfaction of religious needs; (b) to render material support to their members; (c) to organize special meetings for children, young people, women, and for prayer, and in general to organize meetings, groups, courses, departments, and so forth, for Bible study, literature, manual training, and education in religion, and also to arrange excursions and children's parks, to open libraries and reading rooms, to organize sanatoria and medical aid. . . . In buildings and houses of worship may be kept only books which are necessary for the observance of the given cult.' "

THE RULE, THAT ONE SHOULD WORK FOR THE BEST BUT BE PREPARED FOR THE WORST, MAY BE APPLIED TO NATIONS AS WELL AS INDIVIDUALS.

viduals. Every country should seek by all honorable means to maintain peace, and it should be a source of gratification to every citizen that our own government has been seeking to find ways to lessen the chances of war and to reduce the enormous military burdens of the nations. However, it is difficult for the most sanguine student of international conditions as they stand today to feel any assurance that the world is through with war, and that on a large scale.

The efforts to adjust European affairs after the close of the Great War seem to have created new conditions of danger about as bad as any they abolished. The Balkans continue to be the powder keg of Europe, with new irritations substituted for old. Indeed the whole southeastern portion of the Continent is in a dangerous mood, lacking only some aggravating incident to precipitate a very acute situation. In addition to reports and discussions in newspapers and magazines, doubtless sometimes colored by political and commercial bias, it is interesting to get a private view by one on the spot who looks at matters with the sympathies of a Christian worker. A gentleman who has recently been representing officially one of our American churches in the Balkans in a personal letter to a friend drew this picture of the state of affairs:

"Jugoslavia should be better off economically, but it is misgoverned. Like Rumania it has been made far too big for the native governmental capacity. Old Serbia was a little country, of about three and a half millions. Now it has over eleven millions, of whom a large part are minorities, mostly of much higher cultural standards than the old Serbian stock, such as the Croatsians, the Hungarians, and the Germans living in the former Hungarian territories, the rich Batchka and Banat districts to the north, and the Macedonians to the south, mostly all Bulgarian in language and sympathy. Owing to lack of experience, administrative capacity, and moral equipment for the task of governing such a large country it is being impoverished to an alarming degree.

"Militarism is in the saddle. With unwilling subject nationalities to keep in check and surrounded as it is now on all sides, with the exception of Greece, by states that have old scores to settle, Jugoslavia presents one armed camp. In pro-

portion to its size it has undoubtedly the biggest army in Europe. The maintenance of this vast military establishment swallows up many millions which the country can ill afford. Add to this, inefficient and corrupt administration, and you can see what the country is heading for.

"There is a very uncertain condition arising from dissatisfied and suppressed minorities and the political rivalries between the various Slav elements within the country, like Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, and Bosniaks; and there is the still more uncertain situation respecting Bulgaria, Italy, and Hungary. Italy is pressing through Albania, Bulgaria is smarting under the bitter memories of Serbia's action in the Balkan war of 1913, and Hungary is looking for a chance to get back the vast and rich territories lost to both Yugoslavia and Rumania. There are only about seven million inhabitants in present Hungary; but about five and a half million Hungarians are subject to other states. And there are about four and a half million Bulgarians in present Bulgaria; but about two millions are subject to other states. In both cases the other states are Yugoslavia and Rumania, two most corrupt countries.

"These conditions cannot last long. Even Bulgaria, limited through the peace treaties, is preparing for the inevitable conflict. Most people who know conditions here state that there must be another outbreak within ten or fifteen years. It may not be deferred that long, for the present tension between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, with frequent murders of Bulgarian peasants on the western frontier by Yugoslavian gendarmes, may easily lead to much more serious happenings."

THE WESTERN WORLD HAS A VERY IMPERFECT GRASP OF THE fundamental changes that have quite recently been taking place in Turkey. The papers, after the manner of papers, have occasionally given reports of some of the more spectacular things, but little has appeared in the way of a comprehensive account of Turkey's struggle to become a modern state, more especially of that part of the struggle covered by the past twenty years. One of the important changes has been the development of religious freedom. In 1928 the Turkish constitution was changed to abolish Islam as the state religion. However, on account of the former close interrelation of this religion and the state, such a revolutionary measure has actually put the Mohammedans at a greater disadvantage than

those of other faiths, for the former were not equipped for independent existence.

In an article upon Dictatorship and Reforms in Turkey, in the *The Yale Review*, Halidé Edib has referred to this peculiar situation and makes some general observations concerning the relations of religion and the state which are striking, not because of their originality but because of their origin:

"Now that the schools give no religious instruction, and the religious institutions have been abolished, the Islamic community, if it is going to last as a religious community, must create its own means of religious teaching, its own moral and spiritual sanctions. Further, in the ritual and in the fundamentals of worship, there are likely to be changes among the Moslems in Turkey. Such changes should be allowed to take place without governmental interference. The occasional attempts of university professors to propose new forms of worship in Islam—such as substituting organ music for vocal music, allowing worshippers to enter the Mosques without taking off their shoes, the placing of benches so that the faithful may pray seated, and the doing away with a number of complicated bodily movements in prayer—have met with profound displeasure. All these changes might be carried out by the wishes of the people, but governmental interference in this most sacred part of men's rights must constitute a dangerous precedent. The fundamental meaning of the long and very interesting phases of secularization is that the Turkish psychology separates this world from the next. To take religion out of the political state, but to keep the state in religious affairs, is one of the contradictory aspects of the last phase which must be corrected.

"Not only in Turkey but wherever religion is interfered with by governments, it becomes a barrier, and an unremovable one, to peace and understanding. Yet the basic doctrine of every great religion is peace and the brotherhood of men. If only religions could be freed from political influences all over the world, the barriers between peoples of different creeds would break down sooner than one supposes."

BOOKS

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO SAINT MARK¹

THE VOLUME under consideration is the most recent in the series which is being published under the title of *The Clarendon Bible*. The series is admirably representative of contemporary British scholarship. The general editors are the Bishop of Oxford, Bishop Wild, and Canon G. H. Box. Two of the previous volumes were prepared by the author of the present work, Canon A. W. F. Blunt.

Each new series of Biblical commentaries has some special objective which one does well to keep in mind in any attempt to evaluate it. Criticism not infrequently goes astray by overlooking or ignoring the purpose and underlying intent of a book. Which is to say that the fairness of the reviewer will depend in part on his use of the author's own measuring stick. The editors of *The Clarendon Bible* seem to have the teacher especially in mind. They feel that

"The problem of the teaching of Holy Scripture at the present time presents many difficulties. There is a large and growing class of persons who feel bound to recognize that the progress of archaeological and critical studies has made it impossible for them to read, and still more to teach, it precisely the same old way. However strongly they may believe in inspiration, they cannot any longer set before their pupils, or take as the basis of their interpretation, the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of the Holy Scripture." (P. 5.)

To meet this problem of teaching and reading the Bible, they propose to place the books of the Bible in their historical context in order that, as far as possible, the sense which they bore when written may be recovered. This obviously will involve matters of criticism, and so the editors state:

¹ *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*. In the Revised Version, with Introduction and Commentary. *The Clarendon Bible*. By A. W. F. Blunt, B.D., Vicar of St. Werburgh, Derby; Hon. Canon of Derby. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1929. Pp. 272. Index. Maps. Illustrations.

"It is not the writers' intention to set out the latest notions of radical scholars—English or foreign—nor even to describe the exact position at which the discussion of the various problems has arrived. The aim of the series is rather to put forward a constructive view of the books and their teaching, taking into consideration and welcoming results as to which there is a large measure of agreement among scholars." (P. 5.)

One other point to be noted in considering the aim of the series is the readers for whom it is planned. And we are informed that

"It is with the object of meeting the requirements not only of the elder pupils in public schools, their teachers, students in training colleges, and others engaged in education, but also of the clergy, and the growing class of the general public which we believe takes an interest in Biblical studies, that the present series is projected" (p. 5).

One is inclined to wonder who has been omitted from this comprehensive list.

Before attempting to estimate the success with which this present volume fulfills its objective, attention should be called to the attractive form in which the material is presented. One hardly recognizes in these surfaced pages the conventional commentary. Why must a commentary so often be one of the most unattractive books imaginable? And then when one discovers thirty-four well chosen illustrations relating to the historic and geographic background, one is ready to conclude that here is a commentary that is unique and that in one respect at least is a decided improvement. Such features help to justify the inclusion of the "elder pupils in public schools" among those for whom this book is written. Certainly for them and for the general public the attractiveness of the book is an advantage. In this connection it should also be noted that the text in the Revised Version is given as a whole just preceding the comments.

As a commentary on St. Mark's Gospel, however, we are not sure that this most recent volume greatly differs from, or

contributes much to, other literature in this field. Its aims to restore the historic background and its plan in dealing with the questions of criticism are not new. Indeed, both in its discussion of the bearing of modern criticism upon the historical character of the book and in its comments on the text, it resembles to quite an extent the most recent previous work on Mark, the commentary by A. E. J. Rawlinson in the Westminster series. The latter, however, is much fuller and more exhaustive in its textual comments than Canon Blunt's treatment, and, in our opinion, for that reason is a more satisfactory book for teachers and preachers.

Nevertheless, there is much about the book under review to commend it. First, it is based on the Greek text, yet unlike the volumes in the International Critical Commentary, it gives also the English translation, so that those who do not know the Greek do not miss the point. We are not sure, however, that the use of the Greek will help to relate it to the needs of the "elder pupils in public schools" in this country where Greek has long since disappeared from secondary institutions.

Second, although the editors disclaim any attempt to describe the exact position at which critical discussion has arrived, yet inevitably any adequate treatment will do this very thing. That is one of the features which give value to the copious introductory and critical material of this volume. It is the latest and most up-to-date discussion we have, and reference is made to the views of several critical works which have come to light since Rawlinson's commentary.

Third, the fine attitude of the author in dealing with these problems commends this commentary. His is the balanced view that refuses to be carried away by any theory, however attractive, that rests on an insecure foundation; and he constantly calls attention to the danger of pressing any theory of interpretation too far. His general attitude is revealed in a criticism which he makes of Professor Bacon as follows:

"But this scholar, learned and stimulating as he is, can only be followed with great caution. His conclusions are too often

stated with a dogmatic positiveness that refuses to take any account of alternative possibilities." (P. 46.)

Our author on the whole is quite free from this particular besetting sin of the critical expert. An example in point is in the section on The Jesus of the Gospel, in which Blunt criticizes on the one hand Schweitzer's overemphasis of the eschatological idea, and on the other the extreme opposite view of Bacon who finds in Mark's Jesus merely the reforming champion of the disinherited masses of the Jewish people, whose championship ended in failure and death. (Pp. 54-56.) Blunt's question, "Are we sure that any one category is sufficient to include Him?" (p. 58) indicates the balanced view of the book. And his summary of Mark's portrait of Jesus reveals the conclusions to which his excellent discussion leads:

"Though Mark's picture is inadequate and needs supplementing from Q and Proto-Luke (as well as from the fourth gospel), yet it is a true and life-like picture of one side of Jesus' Personality, and of a side which was prominent in Him and which indubitably first fired the Church. (1) Jesus did present Himself as the Messiah of Jewish hopes; He deepened, moralized, and spiritualized that conception; but the Messianic role was one which He adopted. (2) Jesus did foresee His own Death, and believed it would lead to God's Victory. Thus the Marcan picture of Jesus Christ records facts which are vital to our true understanding of what Jesus was." (P. 64.)

In the fourth place, we feel that many will find this commentary helpful because the author generally represents the conservative position on theological questions. While no *a priori* assumptions are supposed to underlie the discussion of the miraculous element, Blunt never throws miracles out as unlikely or endeavors to explain them away. He gives a brief but well rounded discussion of the problem of demonology and in conclusion asks a question which weights the scales in the argument:

"Finally we may ask whether it is so certain, as many assume it to be, that the idea of demoniacal possession is false" (p. 147).

And in his discussion of the Resurrection he not only shows the utter futility of the rationalizing way of dealing with it, but indicates the grounds on which faith in Jesus' resurrection ultimately rests.

In other positions of criticism, Canon Blunt occasionally assumes a position with which not all would agree. His handling of 2:1-12 is a case in point. This he regards as an editorial interpolation because to him it seems impossible that Jesus would have revealed His Messianic claim in this way so early in His ministry. The reader, no doubt, may feel that there are other possibilities in the interpretation of this incident. Others may feel that the author is needlessly severe in his criticism of Mark's style, as in 5:1-20 which he calls a strange and unsatisfactory story, awkwardly, inconsecutively told. (P. 173 f.) He finds little of purpose or unity in the first seven chapters of the Gospel, although in our opinion his analysis of this section really arrives at Mark's purpose in it. And he throws out practically all of chapter 13 as representing the form of our Lord's teaching, although he admits the possibility of His having uttered certain verses in the chapter. But these instances of negative criticism do not greatly affect the general tone of sympathetic understanding and appreciation with which the author introduces the reader to Mark's Gospel.

In closing we raise the question as to the extent to which this treatise realizes its objective, to prepare a commentary for readers all the way from the "elder pupils in public schools" to their teachers and the clergy. In giving our own judgment in the matter it might be helpful to say that it is less elementary than the Cambridge Bible for Schools, and less critical than the International Critical Commentary. The reader may take his stand accordingly. We feel, however, that while it may not be sufficiently comprehensive for the needs of a teacher, it is admirably fitted for college students and for the ordinary intelligent man or woman who is interested in Biblical studies and is ready for thoughtful work.

PAUL C. WARREN.

THE HUMANITY OF GOD²

THIS is the type of book which many victims of our modern high pressure methods of selling projects and ideas will welcome. At no time will the reader be forced to the common defense of sales resistance. The author makes you feel comfortable and at ease from the very beginning. He has achieved the art of psychological relaxation in presenting his material, and this adds decidedly to the literary charm of this work. He is at home intellectually in the field through which he is to take his readers; there are no dangerous foes to fear; he is not nervous as he confronts the problems that arise. No one could write as he writes upon the theme he has selected without perfect peace of mind. This at-homeness has led him to take some liberties with the method of presenting his material. Upon this point we will allow Professor Buckham to make his own explanations. In the Preface he writes:

"A word may be in order concerning the somewhat miscellaneous literary form of the volume. If the reader should find himself wondering at times whether he is reading philosophy or theology, essay or treatise, observation or speculation, dissertation or homily, prose or poetry, I hope he may conclude that there is something of all these in my book. For the treatment of such a theme requires them all—and more. The Divine Fatherhood is not a subject merely for Sunday School instruction or class-room study or hortatory apologetic, but for free, thorough and comprehensive discussion and interpretation, aided by all the resources one can command." (P. xiii.)

Those who are unacquainted with Professor Buckham and his writings may find the title somewhat misleading. It seems to suggest a modern humanistic interest at work in the interpretation of God; but as soon as one has gotten beyond the title any such apprehension will be allayed. For the theme of the book is the divine Fatherhood of God. A single sentence from the Preface gives his real objective:

"It is my hope that at the close, an old, well-thought, well-

² *The Humanity of God*. By John Wright Buckham, D.D., New York: Harper & Brothers. 1928. Pp. xiv+265.

loved and well-lived faith may have been made a little freer from doubt and difficulty" (p. xiii).

The reader is not left in doubt as to the thesis which is to be under discussion. It is clearly stated in the first paragraph of the first chapter:

"Its purpose, instead of being defensive, is, rather, to maintain that *the symbolic conception of God as Father offers an interpretation of religious experience and a theory concerning the ultimate meaning of man and the cosmos which is not only tenable but is more rational as well as more productive of human well-being than any other*" (p. 1).

The method of treating this theme is psychologically sound. The subject of the first chapter is Experiencing God. Within the scope of this experience the author makes room for the full range of universal religious experience from the primitive savage to the highest Christian, and he recognizes the essential psychological identity of this experience. From this start he points out that religious experience possesses such personal and social dynamic that it gives birth to two natural issues, expression and interpretation. It is in the realm of expression and interpretation that variation develops most conspicuously. We are constituted so differently and so molded by racial and social influences that our method of expressing and interpreting our religious experience will be variant. It is out of these products of religious experience that differences in creeds, cults, and conduct grow. The nearest we come to unity is in the fundamental experience itself. Following this unity in experience throughout the multiform interpretations which have been given to it through the names that have been employed to designate its object, our author makes this claim:

"While most if not all of these names predicate something that may be true of God, they are not all of the same worth. Among them there may well be one that is *best*—one that compresses the nature of spiritual reality into a word so replete and moving, so vital, and sufficing, that it manifests its inherent superiority and fitness above all others. Is there such a name?" (P. 13.)

This question is thus answered:

"In 'Our Father' a name for God has been chosen and consecrated—by the religion that has come to be the most widely influential of all—which may well prove to be the most inherently adequate, moving and expansive, name possible" (p. 13).

From this point on, the book deals with the meaning and validity of this conception of God as Father. Other theological interpretations of God are compared with this. Divine Fatherhood is forced to meet the world's philosophies, ancient and modern; natural science and naturalism are contrasted. The mystical experience in its widest interpretation is studied in its light. The author shows that divine Fatherhood is the only conception of God that gives all philosophies, natural science, and its contrasting experience, mysticism, full scope to function.

Having thus disposed of the theoretic difficulties, the author devotes another section of the book to a study of the practical obstacles which seem to make belief in "Divine Fatherhood of God" impossible. The dark side of nature, suffering, death, the problem of history, and the doctrine of Providence. These chapters are remarkable for the frank and honest way in which the authors allows these facts of experience to present their strongest arguments against this conception of God, and the quiet way in which he disposes of them.

In Part IV the author turns pragmatist in his treatment of his theme and calls upon the reader to put this conception to the most severe pragmatic test of experience. The life lived in faith of the divine Fatherhood of God is the most stabilizing, wholesome, productive, that can be nourished by any concept. The social products in human brotherhood are the highest. And finally, in a chapter on The Fulfillment of the Faiths, our author finds in this symbol a concept that alone makes room for the fulfillment of the religious faiths of the world and ages. The last paragraph of this stimulating chapter is so rich and compelling that we will give the reader the benefit of it:

"That religion which has the largest, most compelling, most redemptive conception of God and man, revealed through humanity's most spiritually vitalizing personality, must be, cannot but be, the interpreter, unifier, and fulfiller of the religions" (p. 230).

Here we have gathered up in one sentence the whole range of the newer apologetic for historic Christianity. This book gains its dynamic from the combination of religious experience and intellectual knowledge as they function in a prophetic soul.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

A PREFACE TO MORALS³

THIS book is receiving much attention. It is written in a popular style and deals with topics of general public interest. The author is the editor-in-chief of *The New York World*, but is better known for his writings on economics. He is a young man, still in his thirties, a popular son of Harvard, and much admired by both Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. These facts serve to stimulate the curiosity of the reader. It ought not to be a surprise that an editor and a political economist should write on morals. Did not Aristotle preface his *Politics* with the *Nicomachean Ethics*, and is not Plato's *Republic* largely a moral treatise; and yet, who would have expected Horace Greeley or Charles A. Dana or James Gordon Bennett to write a preface to morals? But surely an editor at the center where news is assembled is in a position to know and to mold moral sentiment.

Editor Lippmann has given the public a popular book. He has done for morals what Will Durant has done for philosophy and what James Harvey Robinson in his *Mind in the Making* has done for psychology. The reader who has wrestled with Thomas Hill Greene's *Prolegomena to Ethics* or James Martineau's *Types of Ethical Theory* will feel as if he had strayed into Bypath Meadow when he comes to this

³*A Preface to Morals.* By Walter Lippmann, New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. viii+348. Index.

book. The general reader will not find himself troubled by theories of the freedom of the will or the problem of evil, such as Jonathan Edwards and Josiah Royce discussed. The book represents modernism in morals up to date, but all this does not mean in any sense that the author is superficial. On the other hand the scope of his knowledge of authorities on the subject is amazing, and he is swift in discerning their meaning. Mr. Lippmann appears to be equally at home with the Bible or Greek literature, Spinoza or Thomas Aquinas. He knows history, he knows theology, and he is well informed on the ethical and religious thought of today. He does not rail, but is serious, with a touch of sadness. He is committed to the proposition, that we can dispense with religion, but we must have morals.

There is a fine balance and a due sense of proportion in the analysis of the subject. The first part deals with The Dissolution of the Ancestral Order; the topic of Part Two is The Foundation of Humanism; and Part Three is entitled The Genius of Modernity. Each of these parts is carefully analyzed and the chapters and sub-topics are well named. The analysis of the whole volume is well worth careful study. The first part is intended to be an obituary to religion, the second part prepares the way for morality without religion on the foundation of the new humanism, and the third part portrays the new morality and its goal.

To Mr. Lippmann Fundamentalism is hopeless obscurantism. It is an impossible bathos. And yet, with fine irony, he gives the prize in the Fundamentalist-Modernist discussion to the Fundamentalists. He is convinced that the acid of modernity has dissolved the traditional order. He believes that revolt has gone far beyond the wildest dreams of the rebels.

"When Luther, for example, rebelled against the authority of the Church, he did not suppose the way of life for the ordinary man would be radically altered. Luther supposed that men would continue to behave much as they had learned to behave under the Catholic discipline. The individual for whom he claimed the right of private judgment was one whose pre-

judgments had been well fixed in a Catholic society. The authority of the Pope was to be destroyed and certain evils abolished, but there was to remain that feeling for objective moral certainties which Catholicism had nurtured." (P. 14 f.)

The same is true for modern revolutionists:

"The Nineteenth Century, roughly speaking the time between Voltaire and Mencken, was an age of terrific indictments and of feeble solutions. The Marxian indictment of capitalism is a case in point. The Nietzschean transvaluation of values is another; it is magnificent, but who can say, after he has shot his arrow of longing to the other shore, whether he will find Caesar Borgia, Henry Ford, or Isadora Duncan? Who knows, having read Mr. Mencken and Mr. Sinclair Lewis, what kind of world will be left when all the boobs and yokels have crawled back in their holes and have died of shame?" (P. 16.)

The author quotes Mr. Alfred North Whitehead, who delivered the Lowell Lectures at Harvard in 1902, as saying, "God is not concrete, but He is the ground for concrete actuality," and after confessing his inability to understand this language he says:

"It is a nice question whether the use of God's name is not misleading when it is applied by modernists to ideas so remote from the God men have worshiped. Plainly the modernist churchman does not believe in the God of Genesis who walked in the garden in the cool of the evening and called to Adam and his wife who had hidden themselves behind a tree." (P. 27.)

But, after roundly scoring some rabid Fundamentalist utterances, he adds:

"Not all the fundamentalist argument, however, is pitched at this level. There is also a reasoned case against the modernists. Fortunately this case has been stated in a little book called *Christianity and Liberalism* by a man who is both a scholar and a gentleman. The author is Professor J. Gresham Machen of the Princeton Theological Seminary. It is an admirable book. For its acumen, for its saliency, and for its wit this cool and stringent defense of orthodox Protestantism is, I think, the best popular argument produced by either side in the current controversy. We shall do well to listen to Dr. Machen.

"Modernism, he says, 'is altogether in the imperative mood,' while the traditional religion 'begins with a triumphant indicative.' I do not see how one can deny the force of this generalization. 'From the beginning Christianity was certainly a way of life. *But how was the life to be produced?* Not by appealing to the human will, but by telling a story; not by exhortation, but by the narration of an event.' Dr. Machen insists, rightly I think, that the historic influence of Christianity on the mass of men has depended upon their belief that an historic drama was enacted in Palestine nineteen hundred years ago during the reign of the Emperor Tiberius. The veracity of that story was fundamental to the Christian Church." (P. 31 f.)

And:

"The liberals have yet to answer Dr. Machen when he says that 'the Christian movement at its inception was not just a way of life in the modern sense, but a way of life founded upon a message. It was based, not upon mere feeling, not upon a mere program of work, but on an account of facts.' It was based on the story of the birth, the life, the ministry, the death, and the resurrection of Jesus Christ. That story set forth the facts which certify the Christian experience. Modernism, which in varying degree casts doubt upon the truth of that story, may therefore be defined as an attempt to preserve selected parts of the experience after the facts which inspired it have been rejected." (P. 33.)

All of this is written, not out of sympathy with conservative Christian thought, but to cut the ground from under the feet of those modern defenders of the faith who seek to found faith upon the flood by discarding the facts of the Gospel. Lippmann's thesis is that ancestral religion is done for; we must take refuge in the shelter of morals. All of us who are aware of the tin and dross of religion, who wonder concerning the world movement in the midst of which we find ourselves, are still ready to question this diagnosis. Surely there are evidences of more vitality in religion than Mr. Lippmann supposes.

Again and again reference is made to the divine government. The author's conception of the morals of religion is in terms of arbitrary precepts imposed upon unwilling devotees. He never gets out of hearing of the thunders of Sinai and seems

never to have learned the ethical principle of Jeremiah and Jesus who find the law within the heart of those who receive the Spirit of God.

The chapters on Government in the Great Society, and Love in the Great Society are of peculiar interest. Mr. Lippmann is more at home when he deals with politics and economics.

"The real law under which modern society is administered is neither the accumulated precedents of tradition nor a set of commands originating on high which are imposed like orders in an army upon the rank and file below. The real law in the modern state is the multitude of little decisions made daily by millions of men." (P. 275.)

And concerning the enforcement of law he says:

"There is here a very fundamental principle of modern law-making; insofar as a law depends upon the initiative of officials in detecting violations and in prosecuting, that law will almost certainly be difficult to enforce. If a considerable part of the population is hostile to the law, and if the majority has only a platonic belief in it, the law will surely break down. For what gives law reality is not that it is commanded by the sovereign but that it brings the organized force of the state to the aid of those citizens who believe in the law." (P. 276 f.)

Here is another fine utterance:

"I include under the term 'deception' the whole art of propaganda, whether it consists of half-truths, lies, ambiguities, evasions, calculated silence, red herrings, unresponsiveness, slogans, catchwords, showmanship, bathos, hokum, and buncombe. They are, one and all, methods of preventing a disinterested inquiry into the situation. I do not say that any one can be elected to office without employing deception, though I am inclined to think that there is a new school of political reporters in the land who with a kind of beautiful cruelty are making it rather embarrassing for politicians to employ their old tricks." (P. 281.)

And concerning statesmanship he says:

"The chief element in the art of statesmanship under modern conditions is the ability to elucidate the confused and clamorous interests which converge upon the seat of govern-

ment. It is an ability to penetrate from the naive self-interest of each group to its permanent and real interest. It is a difficult art which requires great courage, deep sympathy, and a vast amount of information. That is why it is so rare. But when a statesman is successful in converting his constituents from a childlike pursuit of what seems interesting to a realistic view of their interests, he receives a kind of support which the ordinary glib politician can never hope for." (P. 282).

Love in the Great Society is a masterpiece of irony. The author presents the modern views of love in such a thorough-going way that the reader anticipates his acceptance of what he finds:

"The modern audience is composed of persons among whom only a comparatively negligible few are serenely happy in their personal lives. Popular fiction responds to their longings: to the unappeased it offers some measure of vicarious satisfaction, to the prurient an indulgence, to the worried, if not a way out, then at least the comfort of knowing that their secret despair is a common, and not a unique, experience." (P. 285.)

He clearly states the love as an art theory of Havelock Ellis and the lower conception of sex relations represented by Mr. W. M. C. Joad, and then with swift penetration he says:

"There is now a generation in the world which is approaching middle age. They have exercised the privileges which were won by the iconoclasts who attacked what was usually called the Puritan or Victorian tradition. They have exercised the privileges without external restraint and without inhibition. Their conclusions are reported in the latest works of fiction. Do they report that they have found happiness in their freedom? Well, hardly. Instead of the gladness which they were promised, they seem, like Hegesias, to have found the wasteland." (P. 302.)

And:

"Individual freedom they have inherited and assumed as a right, but they are concerned with something which their more restricted forefathers assumed—with, that is to say, the value of love itself. No inhibitions either within or without restrain them, but they are asking themselves, 'What is it worth?' and

they are certainly no longer feeling that it is obviously and in itself something which makes life worth the living." (P. 303.)

And his conclusion is:

"It is in the hidden issues between lovers, more than anywhere else, that modern men and women are compelled, by personal anguish rather than by laws and preachments or even by the persuasions of abstract philosophy, to transcend naive desire and to reach out towards a mature and disinterested partnership with their world" (p. 313).

There is no highway through the swamp of dissolute sex life to the kingdom of a better humanity.

In a serious volume such as this it is difficult to place the chapter on *The Insight of Humanism*. After touching on the belief in immortality he says:

"Freud, in a famous paper, has described the passage from infancy to maturity as a transition from the dominion of momentary pleasure and pain to the dominion of reality" (p. 176 f.)

He then refers to a work by Dr. S. Ferenczi of Budapest who says, "The first stage of human development takes place in the womb where the embryo lives as a parasite of the mother's body." He adds on page 180, "It is the memory of that earliest harmony which he carries with him all his days." We can only say that, if these are the intimations of immortality which Humanism has to offer, it is undertaking to fill a big order with slender resources.

This volume is the best presentation of the new Humanism which has so far appeared. It is commanding wide attention. It presupposes the dissolution of traditional religion, and it points to a goal of a human maturity which will express itself in disinterested behavior. Those two words, maturity and disinterested, are favorites with Mr. Lippmann.

But where is the dynamic? Sometimes he speaks of a new birth and spiritual life in terms which a Christian might use; but his meaning is different. The preachers of today and all socially minded and spiritual people must see the challenge of

this author. Many of his indictments are true. Much of his analysis is unsurpassed. Many things to which he calls attention are of primary importance and cannot be neglected. And the brilliance of the writer is telling. There is, therefore, a great need that the Christian point of view should be presented with equal acumen and lucidity.

JAMES PALMER.

THE CHURCH IN HISTORY ⁴

OUR able author of this work, Professor Arthur Wilford Nagler, comes in a good succession. His father was a prominent minister and editor in the German Methodist Church in America and the author of an excellent work (in German) on the Second Coming. He himself is a graduate of what used to be called German Wallace College in Berea, Ohio, but is now Baldwin-Wallace College, and of the Garrett and Harvard schools. His work is fresh, interesting, able, and is not so much church history in the usual sense as a treatise on that science and on sociology, reform, and the "social Gospel," with many criticisms of the church because she did not do more for that "Gospel." Whether the author should have stuck closer to his last, as is done in the still valuable short histories of Fisher, Hurst (Harpers), Jacobs, and Moncrief, and in all the recent German textbooks, this reviewer gives no opinion. A few suggestions that might be of service for a second edition may not be unwelcome.

Augustine did not bring in any new idea with regard to baptism (p. 75), which for two centuries before his time had been everywhere understood as washing away original and—with repentance—actual sin. On page 105, line 2, for "or" read of. It was not a defect of scholasticism that its Scripture interpretation "was literal and of the proof-text variety" (p. 107). Its fault was that it was not comprehensive and accu-

⁴*The Church in History.* By Arthur Wilford Nagler, Associate Professor of Church History in Garrett Biblical Institute. New York: The Abingdon Press. 1929. Pp. 468. Bibliography. Index. The work is divided into two parts: Church History in Outline, and Christian Institutions and Movements. The first part (to p. 68) was considered by the present reviewer in *The Christian Advocate* of October 17, 1929.

rate, not founded on the right texts nor on sufficient Biblical learning. If it had been rightly literal and of the proof-text variety, we should never have heard of scholasticism. The "aristocracy" of the middle class did not set up a "new religion" (p. 131), but promoted civil liberty, purer faith, and many reforms, though it wanted order and not anarchy.

The missionary spirit was not smothered at the Reformation under "doctrinal disputations" (p. 147). The greatest missionary age in history (say 1800-1900) was the most interested in doctrine. When your house is burning down you are not visiting sick neighbors or thinking of the sick heathen. There was no historical chance for foreign work by the Reformers. Nor did they "check the humanistic spirit," except in the sense that when God thrusts religion into the foreground general culture waits its turn in confidence, knowing that religion and culture are both His handmaids. And these poor Protestant non-humanists, in spite of their Reformation troubles and in the midst of them, founded half a dozen universities! They "narrowed the realm of religious activity." You can't be everything at once. Did they carry on one religious activity as well as they could under the circumstances? They had a "dubious attitude toward the aesthetic." Well, they kept the pictures, the churches, the windows, and they had their own artists. They had a "dualistic view of life." What kind of view is that?

Luther struggles against one "external authority" to introduce another. He did throw down the authority of the papacy to introduce the authority of conscience, of faith, of the Bible, and, after 1530, the subordinate authority of confessions of faith. If he had not we should never have heard of him nor of this history. Luther "combatted scholastic intellectualism" (whatever that is) to pay homage to doctrinalism. But Luther objected not at all to scholasticism because it was intellectual, but only because it was error. And as to his "intellectualistic doctrinalism," how can you have doctrine at all, even the most "modern" and vague, without intellect and without making your doctrine "intellectualistic"? Or will you

mix your paints with brains, but not your doctrines? And as to "doctrinalism," Luther was the least doctrinal of all the Reformers, the most suggestive, fructifying, many-sided, religiously satisfying; that is the reason why he is the favorite, rather than Melancthon or Calvin, of the German "liberals." He was far from being a "dogmatic despot" (p. 152); study his relation to various attempts at union and you may be surprised.

The Calvinists and Luther "insisted upon total depravity and utterly denied moral freedom" (p. 156). Depravity was total as to power to begin of oneself the salvation process, but both Luther and Calvin affirmed moral freedom in ordinary relations, civic righteousness, etc. When Luther and Melancthon sent out their instructions to the Visitors, 1527-1529, they emphasized freedom of the will. Far from "twisting the Bible by the scrap theory" (what theory is that?) both Luther and Calvin held that not all parts of the Bible were of equal value nor inspired in the same way. The number of Calvinists who "opposed" foreign missions was almost negligible, like the Anti-Mission Baptists. Probabalism is not that the "probability of a thing being good makes it good" (p. 164, note), but this: One unimpeachable authority in moral theology for conduct or speech makes it probably correct, so that the priest in the sacrament of penance must take this into account.

The author criticizes Pietism (p. 177), and in less degree Moravianism, for being too orthodox; but we forget that it was this very doctrinal purity which gave these movements their power, as it was with Methodism. The Friends are praised for their freedom from the "dogmatism" of the church (p. 183), whereas it was the clinging of the Friends to certain Scriptural principles both in doctrine and morals which gave their movement consistency and coherence, and has been the chief means of its persistence and influence. It would be better to give Wesley's famous "slogan" accurately (p. 184): "I look upon all the world as my parish." (The thought had been at home in all the Wesley circle, but, so far as we know, John was the first to give it this expression, which he did in a private letter early in

his work.) It is exaggerating to say that evangelicalism was individualistic and hostile to culture (p. 194). It was the spring of antislavery, and it furnished a race of scientists to Cambridge. And it is invidious to speak of it as "mediaeval" in theology, unless we must reject the existence of God because Aquinas believed in it.

Schleiermacher (see pp. 203-206) was fatally defective as to God and immortality, and also as to Christ. He was essentially Unitarian—Christ a God-filled man. He was too independent of the New Testament, as was Ritschl also. You want something besides "experience and history." Otherwise you make Christianity a dissolving view.

In all things essential to Christianity Calvin did not hold that God was inscrutable, nor that He did not "move in nature, history and experience" (p. 209). Where does Christ come in (p. 210)? According to Christianity He is central. Judaism and Mohammedanism also have God. The evangelicals did hold that man was spiritual, akin to the divine (p. 212), but they did not hold that he was saved by spiritual forces within, but by Christ working by the Holy Spirit on these forces and awaking others. No one held to a "mechanical dictation" of Scripture, but evangelicals held to objective inspiration working through the natural process and normal relations between God and man, intensifying that relation for revelation. According to Coleridge other literature did not have that inspiration in kind, or in fulness in degree. Maurice was much more Scriptural on Christ than Schleiermacher (p. 214), and even this book shows that before Maurice and Kingsley it was by no means true that the "individualistic note had constituted the whole symphony of the Christian faith." On page 215, for 1884 read 1881.

Far from Carlyle having "deep sympathy for the submerged tenth," he had sympathy neither for these nor for general benevolences nor for specific reforms like antislavery, temperance, suffrage, etc., though he was kind toward an individual case of want he would meet on the streets. See his *Latter Day Pamphlets* and the 16th and 17th chapters of

Froude's *Carlyle's Life in London*. On page 221, for Adolph read Adolf. The author does not mention important investigations of Zahn, who has corrected many of Harnack's results by more objective studies. Tyrrell was dismissed, but not expelled, from his order, the Jesuit (p. 223, note). Later, after his attack upon the bull *Pascendi*, he was forbidden the sacraments pending appeal to Rome, but was never excommunicated in the proper sense. Tyrrell was not a Roman Catholic in the modern sense at all, and knew that he was not, as he rejected and bitterly attacked the Trent and Vatican Councils.

"The conviction of the ages abides, that in Christ God is found. Men see God incarnate in man" (p. 226). We should hope so. But that is not Christianity. God is found in every man, especially in every saint, and is incarnate in man and nature, in Socrates and in every flower. But that pale theism did not make Christianity, for it came from the vigorous faith that Jesus Christ was the eternal Son of the Father, believing in whom man receives salvation and eternal life. No one knows yet how far religious education is to become a "new saving agency" (p. 245). What would it have done in the times of the Reformation and the Methodist revival? Bushnell went much further than "his moral influence theory" (p. 254). He held that law or righteousness had its seat in the bosom of God and found its expression in atonement. It is by no means true that what the author calls "legalism and doctrinalism are summarily cast out when religion finds its true center in experience" (p. 257). Both are themselves the result of experience, as in the past is every religious phenomenon in the world. There was never a time when "other compartments" of life were regarded as "outside the sphere of religion" (p. 259). It is a poor compliment to the children of "the fathers" that they still held the latter's thought because they themselves lacked "sustained thought." On page 262, say the younger Edwards, Bunting, Hodge, and others.

Where do the laymen ("the brethren") come in in that "rule" of the churches by colleges of presbyter-bishops (p. 270)? By the way, speaking of "rule" of churches by

assumed overlords, suppose you turn up the Greek where the word "rule" occurs in that connection in the so-called Authorized Version. It is beyond our knowledge to say that "by the close of the first century the monarchical bishop had made his appearance" (p. 271). All we can say is that by 110-117 A.D. there were bishops, as distinct from elders, in some of the Asiatic towns. Nor is it true that Ignatius "was the author of the fiction that the Apostles appointed bishops as their successors." The nearest a writer so early came to that is in the statement of Clement of Rome, 97 A.D., that apostles "appointed their first-fruits to be bishops and deacons unto them that should believe" (*To Corinthians* 42, cf. 44). On the other hand Clement everywhere assumes the identity of presbyters and bishops. On page 273, line 23, for Constantine read Constantius. The Genevan so called theocracy was not an "ecclesiastical autocracy" (p. 281), as the clergy had no legal power except in sacraments, preaching, etc. Even the consistory, which supervised morals, had twelve laymen, members of the common council, to five ministers.

The movement under Wesley was not only a revival of doctrine (p. 282), but was emphatically so. The new birth through faith in Christ, the witness of the Spirit, the evil and danger of sin, justification and sanctification—these doctrines took on new range and power, and so the movement became a revival of religion. Christianity itself is both doctrine and life, and life because of the truth from which it springs (see p. 286). The witness that Cyprian gave to Rome's faith was not in his strife against heretical baptism (p. 287), in which he went against Rome, but in his strife for church unity. The parish priest was called secular, not because he was "of the world" (p. 309, note), but because he was in the world, not in a monastery. On page 321, line 3, for "early" read middle. In spite of "some scholars," not only was Paul not the "real founder of the church" (p. 322), but among the apostles Peter was, first among Jews at Penecost and then among Gentiles in the conversion of Cornelius and others.

Respecting Russia there is no mention (p. 331) of the

devastating and fearfully cruel persecutions of the Christians by the atheist Soviet authorities. As to the cause of the triumph of the church over paganism, if there had not been (besides "spirit and life," p. 332) a vigorous faith there would have been no dynamic for that tremendous task. The Christians themselves would have dissolved in incoherent units. It was mainly their belief which made them a conquering force. Of course personal influence helped, but the "psychological law of spread" would have been powerless without the faith behind the law. It would be better to say missionary message of Erasmus instead of "messages" (p. 334), for it was only in almost his latest book that we have his well known words.

Not only has the Formula of Concord not "sunk into deserved oblivion" (p. 350), but it is accepted by the majority of the Lutheran synods and pastors in America. Although only the General Synod formerly did not officially accept it, yet in the union of that synod with the General Council and the Synod of the South in The United Lutheran Church in 1918 the General Synod received it as a subordinate creed.

How was the supernaturalism of the Socinians "crude" (p. 354)? It was exactly because the "orthodox" in the old conflicts held that divine and human substance were not exclusive but thoroughly congenial that they won and deserved to win, and therefore preserved Christianity as a monotheistic religion. Their solution, then, as far as it goes ought to "satisfy us in our modern milieu" (p. 367), and in every other milieu. To the forces which have made some old ideas "untenable" (p. 372) should be added a better understanding of Scripture. On page 378, line 8, for "first" read second.

JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER.

BABYLONIAN LIFE AND HISTORY ⁵

THIS work by the eminent Assyriologist and Egyptologist of the British Museum, Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, is dedicated to

⁵ *Babylonian Life and History*. By Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, Kt., M.A., Litt.D. (Cambridge), M.A., D.Litt. (Oxford), D.Litt. (Durham), F.S.A. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. xxii+296. Appendix. Bibliography. Index. With eleven plates and twenty-two illustrations.

Babel = Bibel

the late not less eminent Orientalist and theologian, A. H. Sayce, "in memory of an unbroken friendship of fifty years"—a touching tribute worthy of both great scholars. We learn from the Preface that this is not really an absolutely new volume, and we quote the words of the author himself telling the interesting history of how it came to be written in the present form:

"In 1883, at the request of the late Rev. Richard Lovett, M.A., General Editor of the publications of the Religious Tract Society, I wrote for their Series of *By-Paths of Bible Knowledge* a little book entitled *Babylonian Life and History*. This youthful production was stereotyped and reprinted several times, but during the Great War the lead stereotype plates were requisitioned by the Government for military purposes and melted down, and the book went rapidly out of print. Early this year the Rev. Dr. C. H. Irwin, the present General Editor, told me that his Society wished to keep the book on their List of Publications, and suggested that it should be revised before they reprinted it. It was quite clear that a book written forty-two years ago would need a considerable amount of revision, especially when the subject treated of in it was Babylonian History. The excavations which have been made by the English, French, Americans and Germans in Babylonia, Assyria and Persia during the last forty years, have yielded up such a mass of new information that Assyriologists have been obliged to rewrite the ancient history of those countries. And philologists in England, Europe and America have been as diligent as the excavator, with the result that a great mass of Sumerian, Anzanite, Babylonian and Assyrian texts have been published, many of them with translations and luminous commentaries. Moreover, Assyrian dictionaries have been compiled, Assyrian and Sumerian Grammars have been written, and the principal features of the great ancient civilizations of Western Asia have been described with a fullness and with a degree of accuracy that the greatest Assyriologists of the 'eighties' never imagined to be possible.

"In accordance with Dr. Irwin's suggestion for revision, I went through my *Babylonian Life and History*, and soon came to the conclusion that no revision would bring the book up to date, or even make a passable job of it. I therefore reported to him that the book must be rewritten and, of course, enlarged.

To this he agreed, and the present volume is the result." (Preface, p. vii f.)

The volume is divided into twelve chapters, besides an Appendix containing the list of the principal kings of Babylonia, a very useful Bibliography, and a complete and well arranged Index. Furthermore it is enriched with eleven fine plates about which we learn that "The plates in this book are printed from 'electros' which the Trustees of the British Museum kindly allowed to be made from the blocks used for the plates of the official *Guide to the Babylonian and Assyrian Antiquities*, 3rd edition, London, 1922" (Preface, p. xvi).

Likewise there are twenty-two illustrations in the text itself, of which we are told that "The 'line' illustrations are taken chiefly from that great treasure house, 'Cuneiform Texts,' published by the British Museum, and Koldewey's invaluable work, *Das wieder erstehende Babylon*, Leipzig, 1913, and *The Museum Journal*, published by the University Museum at Philadelphia" (Preface, p. xvi).

The twelve chapters into which this work is divided bear the following titles: The Country of Babylonia and the Euphrates and Tigris; Babylonian Chronology and History; The City of Babylon; The Babylonian Story of the Creation; The Babylonian Story of the Flood as Told in the Gilgamesh Epic; Babylonian Religious Beliefs; The Code of Laws of Khammurabi; Babylonian Religious and Magical Literature, Legends, etc.; The King of Babylonia and His People and Their Lives; Babylonian Writing and Learning; British Museum Excavations in Babylonia; The Excavations at Kish, Near Babylon. The last two chapters are really those which bring the book up to date with the most recent discoveries, although, of course, the author is very careful to make use of the most recent material throughout the volume whenever the opportunity presents itself. About these two last chapters Dr. Budge gives us the following information:

"The account of the important excavations in Babylonia given in Chapter XI is based upon the published articles by the excavators in the *Journals* of various learned Societies, and on

Mr. Woolley's Report on Ur of the Chaldees for 1924-5, which, by the courtesy of the Trustees of the Joint Expedition of the British Museum and the Museum at Philadelphia, I was permitted to see in manuscript. I am indebted to Professor S. Langdon for the main facts about his excavations at Kish. He allowed me to read the proof sheets of his recently published work on Kish, and from these Chapter XII has been compiled. The importance of the results already obtained justifies the fervent hope that means will be forthcoming to permit the completion of the excavations of the Temenos at Ur of the Chaldees, where the Library still remains undiscovered, and of the other mounds at Kish." (Preface, p. xv f.)

But what makes the volume extremely valuable to devout students of the Bible is the testimony, which this veteran scholar of high standing so emphatically gives, as to the uniqueness and the originality of the Hebrew religion when contrasted with the Babylonian conception of God. He also, courageously and plainly, denounces those who would hold this to be otherwise:

"A popular work of this kind is no place for the discussion of matters which are still the subjects of animated disputes between Assyriologists and theologians. But a reference must here be permitted to the attempts that have been made by the late Prof. F. Delitzsch and his followers to belittle the Religion and Literature of the Hebrews and to prove that they were derived from the Babylonians. It is admitted by all that the Hebrews, together with other Semitic peoples, inherited some of their legends, folk-lore, mythology, customs, laws, etc., from the Babylonians. But he who seeks to find in the Babylonian religious texts any expression of the conception of God Almighty as the great, unchanging, just and eternal God, or as the loving, merciful Father; or any expression of the consciousness of sin, coupled with repentance, or of an intimate personal relationship to God, will seek in vain. The Hebrew's sublime conception of Yahweh was wholly different from the Babylonian's conception of Bêl-Marduk, or Shamash, or Ashur, and the difference was fundamental. Yahweh was One (Deut. vi, 4); to the Hebrew there was no other; Bêl-Marduk, or Shamash, or Ashur was only 'Lord of the Gods,' just as in Egypt Ra or Amen was 'King of the gods.' The Babylonians may have developed a monotheism comparable to that of the Hebrews,

but there is no evidence that they did, and there is no expression of it in their religious texts. And the Accounts of the Creation given in Genesis and the Story of the Flood are not derived from any Babylonian versions of them known to us. There are many points of resemblance between the cuneiform and the Hebrew Versions, and these often illustrate each other, but the fundamental conceptions are essentially different. The Babylonian God was a development from devils and horrible monsters of foul form, but the God of the Hebrews was a Being who existed in and from the beginning, Almighty and Alone, and the devils of chaos and evil were from the beginning His servants.

"A perusal of the Two Lectures by Delitzsch, entitled *Babel und Bibel*, has convinced me that the object of them was to belittle the Hebrew Scriptures, and to exalt the writings of the Babylonians, and to show that, after all, the Prophets of Israel and the Babylonian scribes belonged to the same class of religious teachers, and that the subject matter taught by both was one and the same in kind. Delitzsch's knowledge of comparative Semitic philology, was, as was pointed out many years ago, never very profound, and many of the views which he put forward in his *Hebrew Language viewed in the Light of Assyrian Research*, London, 1883, were shown to be incorrect. The Lectures alarmed many both in Germany and in other countries, because it was felt that their general effect would be to undermine the beliefs of those who were unable to verify or control Delitzsch's statements and deductions. The truth is that he could not appreciate or realize the difference between the Religion of Israel and the half-magic, half-religious beliefs of the Babylonians. To him the Hebrew Scriptures would always remain a monument of a great religious and historical process, whether they were shown to be inspired or not, and nothing more. He himself wrote: 'As for myself, I live in the belief that the old Hebrew Scriptures, even though they lose their character as writings "revealed" or pervaded by a "spirit of revelation," will still always maintain their exalted importance, more particularly as an unparalleled monument of a great religious and historical process which extends to our own time.' Had Delitzsch known more of Hebrew and Babylonian Literature he would never have written thus." (Preface, p. ix ff.)

Equally plain are the words which Dr. Budge uses in denouncing the recent attempt, by Zimmern, to show that the

New Testament doctrine of Christ's death and descent into Hades is derived from the Babylonian myth of Bêl-Marduk. While fully recognizing the value of Zimmern's work as a translator, Dr. Budge does not hesitate to declare this:

"Now the value of Zimmern's work on the texts describing the celebration of the New Year Festival at Babylon is very great, but his comparison of the New Testament account of the death and resurrection of the Lord Christ with the Myth of Bêl-Marduk is both unfortunate and unscientific. Apart from the fact that Bêl-Marduk was a mythical being, and Christ a historical Person, it is the narrative of the death and resurrection of Osiris, that must be compared with the Myth of Bêl-Marduk, and not the New Testament account of Christ." (Preface, p. xiii.)

Our brief review is far from doing full credit to this valuable volume which we believe ought to be in the library of every student of the Old Testament.

AGIDE PIRAZZINI.

COLLEGE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION ⁶

THIS book is the outcome of the action of the International Convention of the Disciples of Christ, in 1922, to the effect that all the organizations reporting to it should make a thorough survey of the work being done by and under their respective boards. Accordingly the Board of Education undertook a complete and searching survey of the thirty colleges and universities affiliated with their church "to obtain accurate information in a scientific manner regarding their work and needs." Floyd W. Reeves and John Dale Russell were secured to assist in making the proposed survey and preparing the findings. The present volume is one unit in the report made to the International Convention in Seattle, August 7-14, 1929.

As a careful report by competent men to a single ecclesiastical body regarding the colleges affiliated with it, this is a splendid piece of work; but it was evident that such a book,

⁶ *College Organization and Administration. A Report Based Upon a Series of Surveys of Church Colleges.* By Floyd W. Reeves and John Dale Russell. Indianapolis: Board of Education, Disciples of Christ. 1929. Pp. 324. Index. Tables. Diagrams.

pioneering in a new field, might be of much wider usefulness, and so we read:

"The present widespread interest in the problems of higher education has prompted the writers to offer a volume devoted to the principles of college organization and administration. The effect of the spirit of scientific investigation, resulting in the derivation and application of new techniques, has been much later in reaching the field of higher education than was the case in the general field of public education in its elementary and secondary levels. . . . There seems little doubt, however, that, although late in arriving, the movement will have just as marked an effect on higher education as it has produced and now is in the process of producing in elementary and secondary education."

"The formulation of the principles of organization and administration of higher education seems a natural outgrowth of college surveys. Principles of administration, at first derived empirically, can through the medium of a considerable number of surveys be tested out in actual conditions, results compared and contrasted, and a sort of experimental proof obtained through the observation of the operation of suggested modifications which are made in the light of the tentatively derived principles of organization and administration.

"It has been the good fortune of the writers to have engaged in a considerable number of college surveys, some sixty different institutions having come under their observation through the medium of complete and thorough-going survey. The present volume represents the codification of those principles of organization and administration of higher educational institutions that have been tried and tested by the writers in these various college surveys, and that have survived the experimental test of observation in actual operation.

"Throughout the work there has been a constant effort to make the text practical, rather than theoretical. A large amount of descriptive material, taken from the text of actual survey reports by the writers has been introduced, not only for the purpose of illustrating the principles being discussed, but also for the purpose of leaving no doubt in the mind of the reader as to the practicability of the principles presented. The college administrator will find many tables which will be of value as standards for checking his own institution.

"The volume has been prepared with the thought that it will be of interest not only to college presidents, but also to the

administrative staffs of colleges, particularly to deans, registrars, and business officers, and in general to students of the problems of administration of higher educational institutions. The writers also cherish the modest hope that the volume will prove of interest and worth to all those who are engaged in the service of higher education, as members of faculties of instruction, as members of boards of trustees, and as members of church boards having some control over the financial resources of denominational colleges." (Preface, p. 3 f.)

Because of the wide scope of the book and the multiplicity of subjects covered it is impossible in a brief review to give much more of an insight into it than that conveyed by certain chapter headings, with a bare suggestion as to the content of each:

The Service of Higher Educational Institutions. Denominational colleges usually limit their programs to teaching students, without attempting research. They are valuable in providing instruction and training for religious work. A decreasing percentage of graduates enter religious service. More than half enter the field of education.

Control, Organization and Internal Administration. Large boards, favored for financial reasons, are disadvantageous for efficient administration. Boards should legislate and employ experts to execute and manage. The president is general manager and the subordinate officer of administration and instruction.

Programs of Studies. Three significant trends are noted: (1) The development of the junior college; (2) the introduction of orientation courses; (3) replacement of the elective system and its successor, the major and minor system, by "fields of concentration" for study.

Problems Relating to Students. There is too wide variation in preparation time for various courses.

The Instructional Load. Here is discussed the question, how to measure and equalize the service loads of members of the teaching staffs.

The Faculties. Salaries, organization, retirement provi-

sions, tenure, training, and contribution to scholarly literature are taken up in this chapter.

Accounting and Budgetary Procedure. Common failures are pointed out, and valuable suggestions are given.

Cost Studies. Accounts not only assure proper use of funds, but also aid wise administration. A helpful analysis is suggested.

Effective Use of Financial Resources. There is need of some standard of what education ought to cost in colleges of various sizes and incomes.

Sources of Revenue. Endowment investments, their common abuses and wise handling, and sources of increased revenue are dealt with.

Scholarship and Loan Funds. This unusually suggestive chapter covers a real problem. Deserved tribute is paid to the Harmon Foundation, and the Hiram College plan.

Economic Factors Affecting the Support of Institutions of Higher Learning. Financial support of a college is chiefly dependent upon the economic status of the commonwealth in which it is located. When a college should cease to operate is considered here.

Present Status of the Institutions. This is one of the most interesting chapters, because it is devoted to an analysis of the recent improvements in the colleges, many of which are direct outcomes of the survey program, and therefore it is a demonstration of the effectiveness of the survey method.

College Organization and Administration will render a very substantial service, and it should lead the way to an increasing application of scientific method to the analysis of problems in the field of higher education.

KEMPER G. MCCOMB.